DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 229 UD 010 129

AUTHOR	Valentine, Charles A.
TITLE	Blackston: Progress Report on a Community Study in Urban Afro-America.
PUB DATE	Feb 70
NOTE	132p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.70
DESCRIPTORS	*Biculturalism, *Black Community, Economic Disadvantagement, *Ethnic Status, Ethnology, Inequalities, Intergroup Relations, *Low Income, Low Income Groups, Negro Culture, Negroes, Research Methodology, Sociocultural Patterns, Socioeconomic Influences, Urban Areas, *Urban Population

ABSTRACT

The research in this paper explores the nature and operation of intergroup inequality, as well as means of its eventual elimination, by initiating an ethnography of a representative low-income urban Afro-American community through the method of in-resident participant-observation. Two primary hypotheses are tested. The first, which was predicted to be invalidated by the data, and in fact was, is that the collective behavior and social life of the community conform to a "culture of poverty" which is supported by distinctive socialization patterns and which in turn perpetuates the condition of being poor. The second, which is now being explored, is that the collective behavior and social life of the community area are bicultural in the sense that each ethnic segment draws upon both a distinctive repertoire of standardized Afro-American group behavior and, simultaneously, upon patterns derived from the mainstream cultural system of Euro-American deprivation. (JM)

ED0 40229

BLACKSTON

Progress Report on a Community Study in Urban Afro-America

Charles A. Valentine

Prefatory Note 1

INTRODUCTION

1. Social Class and Sociological Confusion 2
2. Basic Concepts, Questions, and Values 8

FINDINGS

3. Sketch of the Community 12
4. Poor People With No Culture of Poverty 19
5. Black Cultural Diversity and Unity 54
6. Inequality Imposed and Institutionalized 73
7. Change and the Future 86

METHODS

8. Participation and Study 99
9. Comparing Different Methods 109
Acknowledgements 120
References Cited 121

February, 1970

UD010129

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLES

1. Principal Income Sources of Afro-Americans 20

2. Typical Family Incomes 22

3. Commercial Retail Prices 26

4. Institutional Areas of Participation 29

5. Characteristics of Sample Households 46-47

6. Social Classes 77

7. Ethnic Strata 79

8. Racial Castes 79

9. Ethnographic Participation 102

PREFATORY NOTE

This essay was composed by the individual whose name appears on the title page. Nevertheless, the first person plural is used throughout because the work on which the writing is based has been a joint effort. Bettylou Valentine has been a full partner in all phases of the research since its inception. Jonathan Valentine, who will soon be three, has helped his parents far more than he knows by charming people all over the community under study and increasing our credibility as a family really in and of the community. Our able assistants have contributed much through their secretarial skills and administrative talents, willing efforts, and good humor: Ann Harris during an earlier phase of the research, Barbara Glover more recently. Only the people of the community themselves, however, are uniquely indispensable to this work. It is they who should be its prime beneficiaries.

INTRODUCTION

1. Social Class and Sociological Confusion

The initial objective of the research described here was to test certain well known hypotheses about relationships between culture and poverty (Valentine 1968a:127-140). The approach to be followed was an ethnography of low-income urban Afro-Americans. Our aim was to determine whether a self-perpetuating "culture of poverty," "low-income life style," or "lower-class Negro culture" existed among the people chosen for study. Black ghetto inhabitants were selected because their poverty is conspicuous but poorly understood; they have often been singled out as exemplifying a culture of the poor; and their dynamic response to inequality is a prominent contemporary phenomenon. The anticipated significance of this work was that it would be a major step toward understanding the nature of poverty in the United States. Pre-eminent among obscure issues on which we hoped to cast new light was a basic question: To what extent can the continued existence of poverty be attributed to cultural peculiarities of the poor, as opposed to structural characteristics of the society as a whole? Resolution of this issue would obviously have implications for questions of public policy, including the fundamental problem of how to do away with poverty.

This focus on poverty initially gave our work what might be called a somewhat unsystematic stratificational bias. Believing that the essence of poverty is inequality, we tended to see the overall structural framework of the phenomenon in terms of social class. Though we were by no means unaware of ethnic and other non-class factors (cf. Valentine 1968a:121-126, Valentine et al. 1969:197), our theoretical formulations tended to be essentially stratificational constructs. One reasonable way to restate our original basic question would be: Are differences in behavior, between one social class and another, cultural in the sense of being perpetuated by class-distinctive socialization; or are these differences structural phenomena in the sense of being imposed by the workings of a stratified national social system? More than once we have published critiques of the widespread tendency in American social science to confuse social class with non-class structural dimensions. Yet as we see it now, we had not fully freed ourselves of this very same confusion when we began our current research.

Our hypotheses led us to view the people we were working with primarily as representatives of a class stratum. This hampered our awareness and appreciation of community structure, ethnic differentiation, and the dimension of racial caste. As cultural anthropologists practicing ethnography, we knew we must discover inductively whether or not culture-bearing social units more or less corresponding to the general concept of community exist among the people with whom we were working. As cross-cultural students of multiracial plural societies and as sometime participants in mainstream American society, we also knew full well that we were studying ethnically distinctive representatives of a racial under-caste. Yet all this was somewhat overshadowed and obscured by the theoretical models of class culture which we had set out to test. These guiding hypotheses created a strain toward focusing our work narrowly as an ethnography of a class stratum. This strain led us into a corresponding partial neglect of other broader objectives: community study, elucidation of ethnic cultural diversity, and examination of a portion of the caste structure.

In the eighteen months since beginning this research, we have expanded the scope of our work. By far the major influence leading to this change has been the experience of intensive participatory exposure to the actual conditions of existence in the Afro-American community. We feel this is entirely in accord with the necessary inductive approach and methodological flexibility of ethnographic field work. Another influence of which we are aware is some of the more constructive published criticisms of the principal investigator's theoretical formulations (e. g. Berndt 1969, Carstens 1969, Hannerz 1969a, Leacock 1969. Mangin 1969, Rodman 1968). Additional sources stimulating us to reorient our work include certain reports of research on Afro-Americans either published or brought to our attention since we have been in the field (especially Blauner 1970, Degler 1969, Hannerz 1969b, Kochman 1969, 1970, Stewart 1967, 1968, 1969a, b, and Whitten and Szwed 1970a, b). These combined influences have led us not to abandon our initial orientation but rather to include it in a more comprehensive approach. We believe that the significance of our work has been correspondingly widened.

The narrowness of our initial theoretical focus could not long survive the impact of twenty-four-hour-a-day immersion in the life of a predominantly Afro-American community. Existence in this setting constantly presents one with dramatic evidence of ethnic variety, cultural dynamism, internal stratification within the community, and institutional structures which link the community to the larger society in complex ways defined by the hierarchies of caste as well as class. The concepts of poverty and social class do not help to order such experiences as: Eating the same ribs and greens cooked by men and women whose earned annual income ranges from zero to $12,000, dancing to the same rock records with professionals and illiterates, standing in a mass of peaceful protesters as educators and welfare mothers alike are clubbed to the ground by police, listening to an Afro-American community leader plead with an alien board of education to recognize not only Spanish but also French as languages of equal status with English in the schools, or witnessing the death of a Black baby after he was placed at the bottom of an emergency ward waiting list because his mother accused the physician in charge of discrminating against her and her child.

While daily experiences of these sorts speedily opened our eyes to the phenomenological realities of community, ethnicity, and institutionalized caste, the conceptual apparatus to handle such data was not immediately available. Prevailing conceptions of "Negro culture" (e. g. Berger 1967, Bernard 1966, Keil 1966) all seemed wide of the mark despite their considerable variety. Respected studies of ghetto dynamism generally appeared from our perspective to be banal and establishment-oriented (e. g. Parsons 1966, Pettigrew 1966); so external in viewpoint as to miss the prime essentials (Killian 1968, National Commission 1968 dominated by the fashionable but hardly creative view of angry Blacks as possessed by pathological fury (Grier and Cobbs 1968, cf. Valentine 1969a);and/or so full of gross factual distortions as to be an insult not only to Afro-American communities but also to the intelligence of readers (Etzkowitz and Schaflander 1969, Mayer 1969).

Recourse to the accepted classics of the social science literature on American Negroes was no more helpful. We already knew full well that the pejorative tradition established by E. Franklin Frazier (1932, 1957, etc.) and perpetuated by many others (e. g. Glazer and Moynihan 1963, Moynihan 1965, 1966) was bankrupt (cf. Valentine 1968a:18-47). Reviewing the most influential parallel school of thought, founded by Gunnar Myrdal (1944) and endlessly extended over the past quarter-century (e. g. Rose 1962), was similarly disappointing. Writing within a society on the brink of racial civil war, the late Arnold Rose had the affrontery to assert that Myrdal's absurdly optimistic prognostications about progress toward Black-White amity and equality were coming true. More fundamental, it has now become clear that the Myrdal tradition itself is a glaring example of the very confusion between social class and other forms of inequality which experience in an Afro-American community exposes as a basic weakness of most learned analyses in this field. As Carl Degler has recently put it, Myrdal "falls back upon an essentially class definition of racial prejudice." Degler correctly points out that "to make race prejudice principally class prejudice is to lose the insight into reality that is implied in concepts like caste or color prejudice" (Degler 1969:155, 156). Moreover, Myrdal accepted from Frazier and popularized the notion that Negroes have no culture of their own except a morbidly deficient version of Euro-American mainstream patterns: "The Negro Community as a Pathological Form of am American Community" (Myrdal 1962:927-955). Rereading such writings while living in the midst of a vibrant and dynamic Afro-American community brings home with striking force how far from ethnic and racial realities professional Negro experts can be. It also makes newly clear why many Black spokesmen today denounce liberal social scientists as racists in thin disguise.

Indeed, the more one examines this literature from our viewpoint, the more it appears that many significant facets of the Black experience in the United States have been buried, distorted, or obscured by interpretations focused on social class and closely related concepts. Any number of scholars and indeed whole schools of thought, most of them invoking Marx or Weber, have attempted to encompass the Afro-American collective reality in a stratificational framework. A few years ago St. Clair Drake (1966) summed it up reasonably well by pointing out that, generally speaking, scholars have described a "caste-class system" in the southern U. S. (e. g. Warner and Davis 1939, Davis, et al. 1941, Dollard 1937) and an "ethnic-class system" in the North (e. g. Warner and Srole 1946). More recently a contemporary school of thought in sociology is once again reviving the same old confusion under the explicit rubric of a "stratificational approach" to poverty (S. M. Miller et al. 1967, 1969, S. M. Miller, 1968).

A common feature of all these works is the assertion that each class stratum is characterized by its own distinctive "life style" or "subculture." These putative patterns are often described in terms which make the middle-

and upper-status biases of the authors obvious, to say the least. The middle and upper levels generally are described as following more or less "stable," respectable," "healthy" lifeways. On the other hand, the bottom strata are usually presented as "deviant," "disorganized," "pathological" in their social behavior. (The same writers often put themselves forward as "value-free" social scientists!) These bourgeoiscentric stereotypes seem to be so deeply built into Euro-American mainstream culture and consciousness that they tend to be accepted as common sense, science, or revealed truth.

The consequences of all this with respect to understanding what really goes on in Afro-American communities have been uniformly negative. Black people are obviously concentrated at the bottom of any stratificational hierarchy that might be imagined. Given the premises just described, this must mean that most Afro-Americans are deviant, disorganized, and so forth -- while those few who are otherwise must really not be Afro-American, culturally speaking. In effect, this is just what much of the learned literature is saying. Consider, for example, the formulation of a Negro scholar who obviously identifies himself with the thin elite stratum within his caste: "Integration, in the final analysis, also means that the Negro community must increasingly become more middle-class in values and behavior if it is to win respect and approval" (Drake 1966:36). Here "middle-class" has become a code phrase meaning culturally Euro-American or, more bluntly stated, *White*.

The other side of the cultural-caste coin can also be found in this same source: "The key to understanding many aspects of race relations may be found in the fact that, in American society, the protection of their familiar and cherished life styles is a dominating concern of the while middle classes, who, because many Negroes have life styles differing from their own, have tried to segregate them into all-Negro neighborhoods, voluntary associations, and churches" (Drake 1966:5). Following this statement, Drake makes it clear that he really *means* it by approvingly citing the apologia of Bruno Bettelheim that "protection of class values is a more important variable than race prejudice in structuring relations between Negroes and whites in the North of the United States" (paraphrase of Bettelheim 1963 in Drake 1966:42-43). Thus before our eyes the magic is performed: ethnicity and race are transformed into social class. Drake collaborates with Bettelheim to make it so, much as Myrdal validated his class-disguised racism by conspicuously following the two most important anti-Black Negroes (i. e., colored gentlemen) Washington and Frazier. All these authorities who claim that American Whites reject Blacks because of the latter's class-defined "lifeways" seem to avoid a basic question: How would most Euro-Americans "know" *anything* about Afro-American life except through derogatory stereotypes which automatically dictate rejection?

It now becomes clear that the school of thought quoted so approvingly by people like Drake, beginning with Lloyd Warner and associates, is among the immediate sources of the whole "culture of poverty" orientation which has become the dominant conceptual apparatus in more recent years (Harrington, O. Lewis, Moynihan, et al.). Through the outpouring of writings associated directly or indirectly with the so-called War on Poverty, the washing away of race in the whitewash of class has been completed. While "middle-class" has long really meant "White" in this context, the symbol system has now been tidied up with the general acceptance of "poor" and "lower class" as code expressions for Afro-Americans (i. e., niggers).

As if to punctuate the whole development with a footnote which might show future historians what was really happening here, Bennett Berger has gone so far as to argue explicitly that "Negro culture" is nothing but "lower class culture" (Berger 1967). It is an instructive detail that this argument should be made in the course of reviewing a book widely regarded as a major celebration of Negro culture (Keil 1966). Although Keil sprinkled his text with positive-sounding adjectives and value symbols, the descriptive content of his work added nothing (outside of musical analysis) to the standard pejorative stereotypes projected upon Afro-Americans by mainstream Euro-American culture (cf. Valentine 1968a:84-87, 123-125). In other words, Keil was ostensibly extoling Black heroes, but in actuality he provided precisely the raw material needed to make Berger's argument sound plausible.

It would be quite misleading to imply that these developments have gone entirely unchallenged. Numerous critical questions have been raised, both about existing models of poverty cultures and with respect to conventional interpretations of Negro lifeways. One query is whether lower-class life may not be more variable than common uses of the culture concept suggest (S. M. Miller 1964). Another is whether a focus on alleged cultural distinctions of the poor may not distract attention from crucial structural characteristics of the American social system as a whole (S. M. Miller and Rein 1965). A third issue is that the values of the poor may be much the same as middle-class orientations, merely modified in practice by situational stresses (Rodman 1965, 1968a). The suggestion has been put forward that such putative lower-class characteristics as self-indulgence or inability to delay gratification may be better explained by situational variables than determinants of class affiliation (S. M. Miller, et al. 1965).

It has been suggested that a conceptual confusion between culture and class may be involved in the formulations cited earlier (H. Lewis 1963, 1967, Ferman 1964, Ferman et al. 1965). The contention has been put forward that much research and writing about the poor is seriously biassed in terms of middle-class values (Honigmann 1965a, 1965b, Leacock 1967). It has been argued that the case for Negro cultural distinctiveness in the United States is sometimes overstated or its emphasis misplaced (Ellison 1964, Valentine 1967 . It has been shown that prominent models of distinctive subcultures, both for the poor as a stratum and for Negro Americans as an ethnic category, are seriously inconsistent with the very data put forward to support them (Valentine 1968a). Two additional works have recently elaborated on these and other weaknesses in the poverty literature of the social sciences (Gans 1968, Jaffe and Polgar 1968).

The issues raised by these and similar skeptical reactions have not yet been resolved. Nevertheless, a few investigations employing important elements of ethnographic methodology have produced some of the more solidly documented challenges to widespread notions of subcultural distinctiveness as the principal determinant of the plight of the poor. An early example is the Harlem work of Kenneth Clark who described his research role as that of an involved observer, similar to that of a cultural anthropologist (Clark 1965:xxv). Although Clark is a contributor to the "tangle-of-pathology" school of thought, he nevertheless rejected what he calls "the cult of cultural deprivation" -- rejected it as disguised racism. Another case is the research of Elliot Liebow who carried out a non-resident but intensive ethnographic study of a restricted segment of the black poor in Washington. A major conclusion of this investigation was that "the streetcorner man does not appear as a carrier of an independent cultural tradition" (Liebow 1967:222). Furthermore, Liebow makes it clear that he believes the central cause of poverty among the people he studied is that the society as a whole makes it impossible for many Afro-American males to earn a living and support their families. Yet he does not probe further or seek out the implications of this view. Indeed he gives the impression that he believes public policies already in effect will somehow do away with poverty if only they are pursued with greater vigor and supported with more resources.

These and other critical contributions are no doubt salutary in that they keep open debate and discussion. Yet we do not find that they provide much help directly in our effort to make sense of human realities in an Afro-American community. Perhaps the most important reason for this is that even the most critical of these works fail to get very far below the surface of the problems at issue. What seems to be lacking more than anything is serious grappling with more fundamental questions.

For example, practically all critics from many different fields agree that the so-called War on Poverty is a failure. Yet there has been only the most superficial debate on the causes of this failure. Presumably among the most authoritative of such critiques are those by Seligman (1968), Moynihan (1969), and Clark and Hopkins (1969). Not one of them even takes note of the proposition that anti-poverty policies failed because they were based on an inaccurate, class-oriented understanding of the problem, compounded by a lack of interest on the part of those in power in any kind of basic change. This thesis has been widely available at least for the several years since the appearance of Thomas Gladwin's perceptive little book on the subject (Gladwin 1967). While this may not be the most radically probing interpretation, it is apparently too much for conventional analysts or critics to cope with (cf. Valentine et al. 1969).

Reading the cited works of Clark, Moynihan, and Seligman generates a strong inference that thinkers like these have reached a point at which they cannot entertain fundamental questions about the social problems and public policy issues connected with poverty and race. Conventional social science appears to be in a state of unrecognized crisis: the reigning experts on race and poverty seem to be quite out of touch with the realities of current existence among the poor and nonwhites. As one reads their works from the vantage point of the ghetto, there is a sense of disjunction which calls forth images of mutually exclusive worlds. Dominant models, interpretations, and explanations simply do not seem to be grounded in or tested against relevant empirical knowledge.

2. Basic Concepts, Questions, and Values

Our first major effort to transcend the limitations of social class as a guiding concept was an attempt to delineate the community itself and make it our unit of study. We were determined not to narrow our objective to an investigation of one associational network (Liebow 1967), a single residential block (Hannerz 1969b), a particular voluntary association (Keiser 1969), or some similar small social unit. We were equally uninterested in studying a single restricted aspect of culture such as language (Stewart 1962 et seq.), music (Keil 1966), folklore (Abrahams 1964, 1969), or social movements (Gerlach and Hine 1968, 1970). As far as we know, all anthropological studies of Afro-Americans in the cities of the United States -- and most urban anthropological researches in general -- are limited in one or both of these respects. We do not argue that work so limited is without value or interest. We do contend that such research is partial ethnography which can only produce incomplete answers to the questions we are asking.

It has long been common in non-urban ethnography to attempt reasonably comprehensive coverage of the various aspects of culture. Ethnographers also have traditionally chosen either a community or a more inclusive social entity as their unit of study. These procedures are consistent with a holistic view of culture and with a concept of community as the minimal unit within which behavior representing a full way of life can be observed. Urban ethnographers generally have abandoned this approach in favor of the dictum, from social anthropologists, that "study of large-scale institutional frameworks such as the economic, or the administrative and political, falls to the lot of economists, political scientists and sociologists" (Gluckman and Eggan 1966:xxvi). Accordingly, they produce studies like those cited in the preceding paragraph.

In our view, these practitioners of partial ethnography are no longer studying culture or social structure as such. They are investigating bits and pieces of culture or fragments of communities without attempting a direct understanding of the cultural and structural contexts surrounding their units of study. While these procedures may have their usefulness, they are surely least appropriate for defining and elucidating a whole way of life which is thought to characterize an ethnic group or a socioeconomic stratum. Yet this is just what writers like Hannerz and Keil avow they are doing with their partial ethnographies. This is too great a contradiction to stand unresolved. Either urban ethnographers should admit that they cannot define the ways of life functioning in complex societies, or holistic and community-oriented ethnography should be revived and reapplied to the urban scene. It is the latter alternative that we are attempting to actualize in our current work.

As is often the case in ethnography, before beginning field work we did not know how extensive a social field it might be necessary or possible to examine. We selected a general area because demographic data and preliminary observations showed that its population was representative of the phenomena we wished to study: a poverty-stricken, heavily Afro-American, urban district. Within this area we chose to begin work in a census tract which showed the same characteristics to a very high degree. Soon after we established residence here, it became apparent that the city block was a unit of study much too limited for our purposes. Not only is the block a minimally structured social entity, with a distinctness that is attenuated and partial at best, it is also far too restricted to be representative of a whole way of life. The same difficulties apply in only slightly lesser degree to the neighborhood surrounding the block. Various officially defined territorial units ranging from census tracts to school districts have mutually inconsistent boundaries set by outsiders with little relationship to local social structure. Consequently we have settled on the total community described in the next section as our unit of study.

As will be shown in the following section, this community appears to be quite representative of low-income urban Afro-American ghettos in general. Focusing on the community as such therefore frees us from our initial stratificational bias. Without denying or ignoring the significance of various kinds of stratification for the Black American poor, we are now studying a community rather than a social class. This enables us to formulate more explicitly and face more directly the underlying issues which concerned us from the beginning. This is no longer just an Afro-American ethnography designed to test hypotheses from the poverty-culture school of thought. It is now a community study intended to produce an ethnography of Afro-American inequality. As far as a case study can be used to suggest answers to general queries, this research is designed to throw light on some of the great issues of our time. What is the nature of Afro-American inequality in the urban United States? How does it work? What are its sources, and how is it being perpetuated? To what extent is it related to culture patterns which either arise from or reinforce poverty as such? In what ways is this inequality associated with ethnic cultural distinctiveness? How far is it an expression of institutionalized or structural features of the society as a whole, impinging on Black communities from the outside? What trends of change are evident with respect to Black disadvantage? What is the predictable future?

We feel that by clarifying and sharpening the focus of our work, this reorientation substantially increases the significance of the research. At the same time, these changes also mean that our study has been enormously expanded in scale and immensely increased in complexity. From our present viewpoint, we marvel at the naive audacity with which we initially assumed that an urban Afro-American ethnography could be accomplished within a year or two. As will become clearer below, some five years of intensive in-residence, participant ethnography now seems more realistic.

Neither ethnographic community studies nor any other enterprise of research on human beings is really carried out purely for its own sake or in a philosophical vacuum. The social field is a human collectivity within which the researcher seeks evidence to support or invalidate theories, to explore relationships between social and cultural phenomena, to elucidate social issues or problems, and to identify prospective solutions for human ills. The kinds of questions a researcher asks and seeks to answer are decisively influenced by considerations well outside science in the narrow sense. These include philosophical positions and value premises held by the scholar. The writings of most social scientists are not explicit about these influences on their work. Frequently this ommission is justified in terms of "value-free social science." We do not believe there is any such thing as "value-free" science or scholarship. We feel strongly that relevant values and related beliefs should be made explicit by researchers. This both helps the researcher to minimize the effects of his biases and, at the same time, enables the reader of his work to evaluate it more effectively.

Some basic premises underlying our work should therefore be stated as assumptions. Intergroup inequality is a widespread property of human social orders. Inequality is particularly characteristic of many plural societies and many systems of inter-societal relationship. Inequality is typically supported both by cultural conceptions and by structural hierarchies which enable, justify, and rationalize exploitation, oppression, and destruction of human groups. The most significant systems of inequality in the contemporary world are those imposed by Europeans and Euro-Americans on non-European peoples, including Afro-Americans. These systems should be better understood than they are primarily in order to do away with them, so that they may be replaced by more egalitarian and humane social orders allowing all groups a reasonable measure of self-determination, collective dignity, and fulfillment of human potential. The function of research in relation to all this is to achieve fresh insights into what intergroup inequality is and how it works, with systematic attention to the implications for action to eradicate existing inequities and injustices.

Contrary to arguments often advanced by proponents of "value-free" research, these value premises provide strong support for empirically valid, methodologically rigorous, and theoretically sophisticated science. As far as knowledge and understanding are relevant to eradicating inequality -- to the extent that it is not merely a simple function of the distribution of power, that is -- the present wisdom of the social sciences is obviously inadequate. A necessary (though not sufficient) condition for creating a world of reasonably humane intergroup relations is to probe more deeply for fresh insights into existing systems. Assertion of value positions, or development of ideological rhetoric alone, will not bring about this condition. Part of what is needed is a revitalized and more revealing ethnography of inequality. Whatever may be the motives of establishmentarian scholars or of those who claim their research is not influenced by values, we who stand for radical change have a clear need for a social science that will give us hard-headed, realistic, and creative answers to basic issues. Moreover, the relevant issues are by no means confined to what are usually called the problems of "applied science." The necessary task is nothing less than elucidation of the fundamental nature and workings of social and cultural systems. If social scientists are to contribute to changing a system as stubbornly self-perpetuating as Euro-American domination over other peoples, they will surely have to produce a better science than they have so far.

We ask our basic questions and search for their answers, as far as these may be available in our chosen community, with some concern about who will hear the answers. As already noted, established social science does not seem very ready for realistic or convention-challenging findings in this area. Moreover, there are many indications that unreceptive academics reflect a general attitude that is characteristic of all dominant strata in the society. It may be that the audience which most wants insight into these questions is the community itself, together with other comparable communities of which it is representative. There have been various signs recently that Afro-Americans are engaging in serious self-examination, assessing their collective strengths and weaknesses, estimating the probable future outcomes of different kinds of initiative for change. This may be another instance of a phenomenon recently noted elsewhere. The subjects of anthropological research are not only becoming aware of what the experts are saying about them but sometimes quite sophisticated in evaluating or using such writings. Perhaps urban Afro-Americans will be among the first people to make better use of good research on their communities than outsiders. If this happens, so be it.

FINDINGS

3. Sketch of the Community

The locale of the research described here is a predominantly Afro-American district within a large city of the northeastern United States. In order to preserve the confidentiality of our data, protect the interests of local citizens, and safeguard our relationship with people and organizations here, we refer to this community publicly by the pseudonym Blackston.

Available sources on the history of Blackston are few in number and not especially informative for present purposes (Community Council 1959, Federal Writers Project 1939, Glauber 1963, Hazelton 1925, Landesman 1964, 1969). Compilations and analyses of survey materials are of questionable utility for several reasons (Adamson 1943, B. C. C. 1967, Gelman 1966, Hansen, 1966, U. S. Bureau of the Census 1952, 1962). The territorial limits of surveys have seldom corresponded closely to the present boundaries of the community. The most recent major survey data were collected ten years ago, which makes them very much out of date in this rapidly changing community. Nevertheless, it is possible to sketch the history, demography, and developing socioeconomic characteristics of the area by synthesizing the available sources and updating them wherever possible through intimate current knowledge of the community.

Blackston occupies a space of some two square miles located within two miles distance of an arm of the North Atlantic Ocean. The earliest Euro-American settlers to come here were Dutch and British pioneer farmers. Just over a century ago, a semi-rural village emerged as the farms began to be divided into house lots. Afro-Americans were present in the community from the first years after the Civil War onward, though at first in small numbers only. At least one Negro family headed by a veteran of the Union army settled here at this time.

By the late 1880's realtors from a nearby city were buying land for residential development and encouraging European immigrants to move to Blackston. Those who came were mainly East European Jews from Russia, Poland, and Austria. By 1890 the local population had swelled to little less than 10,000, and it was approximately 50% Jewish. Then as the area was swallowed up first by a neighboring city and next by a still larger metropolis, Blackston became one of the principal Jewish centers in the United States. By 1920 the local population had surpassed 100,000. Of this total some three quarters were Jews. Roman Catholics, mainly Italians, constituted just over 10%, with Protestants present in almost equal numbers. Adherents of the Greek Orthodox church made up the remaining 3%. In 1930 the community reached both its largest size, exceeding 130,000, and its greatest concentration of Jewish citizens, over 80%.

Like many another Afro-American community in the northern United States, Blackston was thus a Jewish ghetto long before it became a Black ghetto.

Large numbers of the Eastern Europeans who lived here were poor. Their community is described in historical accounts as drab, dismal, congested, and noisy. It was a major center of organized crime, with the principal mobs controlled by Jewish leaders, from the era of Prohibition to the end of the 1930's. The garment industry -- sweatshops, union busting, and the rest -- was a prominent feature of the local scene. The socioeconomic status of Blackstonians was not uniform; there were professionals and businessmen as well as other comfortable elements. The citizenry could also boast a considerable intellectual community which included both reformist and revolutionary advocates of social change. Socialists represented the district in the state legislature several times between World War I and the late 1930's.

Beginning with the Great Depression, first gradually and later more rapidly, the local population both declined in numbers and changed in ethnic composition. Through the first two decades of the present century, Afro-Americans appear to have amounted to less than 1% of Blackston's citizenry. Thereafter, according to the census, the Black population grew steadily: 1930 2.5%, 1940 5%, 1950 12%; and as of the last census in 1960 almost 30%. Spanish-speaking Latin Americans, largely from Puerto Rico, began moving into the area shortly after World War II. By 1957 it was estimated that Puerto Ricans constituted 12% of the Blackston population, and the 1960 census showed them as 25%. As early as the late 1930's it was reported, and repeated later, that in Blackston there lived small but noticeable numbers of immigrants from Arabia and Syria. It was also reported, somewhat cryptically, that in the 1930's one six-block area in the heart of Blackston contained "a large group of Negroes" as well as "the only Moorish colony" in the metropolitan area (Federal Writers Project 1939:498-500). Neither of the quoted phrases is further explained in this source or any other yet discovered.

Meanwhile the total population of Blackston declined to some 120,000 in 1960. Our own estimate is that this decline has continued to a 1970 total of around 100,000. Even though large numbers of Afro-Americans and Puerto Ricans have moved in, still greater numbers of former inhabitants have left the area through several processes. These movements include the virtually total flight of Jews, the abandonment of a great many tenements unfit for habitation, and leveling of sizeable tracts through slum clearance. Accompanying these trends have been a considerable drop in median family income, together with increases in most or all other indices generally associated with poverty.

While the present ethnic composition of the community as a whole is difficult to determine with full precision, there is little doubt as to its general contours. The Afro-American proportion has gone on increasing rapidly to become predominant, while the Latin American influx has leveled off more or less. Non-Spanish Euro-Americans have certainly become a numerically negligible element. The latest published estimate of current ethnic composition is that of the local community council (BCC 1967). Taking into account probable changes since that date, possible sources of error in the council estimate, and our own knowledge of the community, we feel that slightly different figures are probably more accurate. According to the BCC 1967 estimate, 60-70% of Blackston people are Afro-Americans, 30-40% are Puerto Rican, and less than 5% are White. We would suggest that today the local population is approximately 65% Afro-American, little more than 25% Latin American, perhaps 5 to 8% Euro-American, and something like 2-3% Asian American, principally Arabs and Chinese. Our own quantitative data on ethnic composition may not be representative of the community as a whole, for we have deliberately concentrated our work in a very heavily Black neighborhood (85% Afro-American, 11% Hispano-American).

Blackston is thus very much a multi-ethnic community. Moreover, there is diversity within each major ethnic grouping, as will become more clear in later sections. Many Afro-American community members are relative newcomers, not only from southern states but also from the Caribbean, northern South America, and most recently even a few from West Africa. Black people with incomes in the middle levels are few here, probably less than 10% of their group, and the Afro-American upper class is not represented at all. Puerto Ricans and other Hispano-Americans are also mainly poor, though a few small shopkeepers are to be found in their ranks, a status that is much more rare for Afro-Americans. Unlike the other ethnic groupings here, most of the Euro-Americans live in sharply separate residential enclaves which are essential peripheral remnants of formerly dominant populations. At the southern edge of the area stands a recently built cooperative apartment complex inhabited by a predominantly Jewish population, while at the northern end a few blocks of two-family houses are still largely occupied by Italian families. Generally speaking, few individuals from either of these enclaves have much to do with community life in Blackston. The Arabs and Chinese are not residentially nucleated, but they are heavily concentrated in a few specialized occupations which make them relatively privileged citizens: shopkeepers, restaurant and laundry owners.

Because there has been so much demographic change over the past decade, it is difficult to relate contemporary conditions to the indications of socioeconomic characteristics and social problems provided by the last census. It does seem safe to assume, however, that all indices generally associated with poverty have worsened significantly during the decade. Older residents and former residents invariably describe the community as deteriorating, and they generally perceive the major deterioration as having occurred or accelerated within the last ten to twelve years. Intimate acquaintance with the contemporary community repeatedly impresses one with the probability that most conditions have worsened significantly in comparison with the picture conveyed by the 1960 census. Moreover, as will be made clear in a later section on methodology, we are quite skeptical as to the validity of census data and other survey findings. Therefore the following statistics are presented only to convey a generalized picture for rough comparison with other communities.

As of 1959, the median family income for Blackston as a whole was only slightly over $4,000. This is a few hundred dollars above the median for urban nonwhites in the nation as a whole, but it must be remembered that only about 30% of the local population was nonwhite at this time. Almost 17% of all Blackston families received incomes of less than $2,000. Indications are that these lowest incomes were heavily concentrated among Afro-Americans. In the physical center of the community, where large numbers of Black residents have been reported ever since the 1930's, every census tract had a recorded median well under $4,000 in 1959. Consistently, tract medians which range between $5,000 and $6,000 occured only on the peripheries of the community, where the population was still predominantly White in 1960. This broad correlation between race and income continues in surrounding districts of the metropolitan area: e. g., one census tract less than two miles from Blackston had an all-white population with a median income of nearly $11,000.

The 1960 census recorded an unemployment rate for Blackston of 8%, which is two percentage points above the corresponding national figure. When the statistics for the most heavily Afro-American tracts are examined, however, unemployment rises to 12% for males and nearly 20% for females. In the community as a whole, almost 60% of those who did have jobs were working in unskilled, semi-skilled, or minimally skilled factory and service occupations. Another 15% held clerical or sales positions. Again one suspects that these conditions have become worse in recent years, despite the operations of governmental anti-poverty programs. There can be no doubt that unemployment and underemployment among teenagers in particular stand at disastrous levels.

Some 85% of all housing in Blackston was built before World War II, more than thirty years ago. This is particularly significant because the quality of much housing constructed here was poor to begin with. At the time of the last census, 8% of all residential units in the community were rated overcrowded, 25% deteriorating, and 8% dilapidated. In a typical heavily Black tract, however, less than one third of the housing was classified as "sound," nearly one half "deteriorating," and the rest "dilapidated." Moreover, non-whites paid 12% higher rent on average than Whites. At this time there were four low-income public housing projects and one middle-income project in the community. Roughly 20,000 people lived in these public housing units. Since then two more low-income projects have gone into operation, so that today perhaps 25,000 people or about one quarter of the community reside in public housing. Other changes during the decade have produced a significant net loss in habitable shelter. Many hundreds of units have been abandoned and stand in various stages of ruin. A majority of inhabited tenements are substandard, many of them with such gross violations as prolonged, total lack of heat and/or water. Blackston has the highest fire rate in the metropolitan area. Only a very thin scattering of multi-family dwellings have been renovated or rehabilitated in recent years. A local urban renewal program was scheduled to be completed this year. All that has been accomplished is that about half a dozen blocks, together with smaller pockets here and there, have been cleared and are standing empty. In any case, the renewal plan calls for new units in the $4-5,000 income range, which will put them effectively out of reach for many present inhabitants of the area.

A sampling of census data on selected indices of health and welfare reveals conditions one would expect to find associated with the patterns already described. This can be seen rather clearly by comparing local data with figures for the large -- and of course predominantly White -- city that surrounds Blackston. The published infant mortality rate for Blackston is 42 per thousand live births, compared with 27 for the metropolis as a whole. The incidence of tuberculosis is 122 per ten thousand in Blackston, 54 for the metropolis. Penumonia and influenza occur at a rate of 83 per thousand in Blackston, 40 in the big city as a whole. The home accident rate in Blackston is 21 per one hundred thousand, compared with 11 for the city. Aid to dependent children was recorded as 182 per thousand youngsters in Blackston, 72 in the whole city. Note that in each comparison the local rate is one the order of double the metropolitan rate. Juvenile delinquency, drug addiction, and crimes against property are recognized throughout the community as major problems.

The territory of the community is divided by two principal commercial streets, the major one running east-west and the other north-south. These are also the main traffic arteries and routes for public transportation into and through the area. On these streets the economic relations between ethnic groups and between residents and outsides are dramatically apparent. Virtually all businesses here are owned and operated by Euro-Americans living elsewhere -- most of them Jews who once lived in Blackston -- while most customers as well as the more menial employees are Afro-Americans or Latins.

Ranged along the community's eastern boundary and southeastern corner is a belt of light and medium industry: clothing factories, box makers, a manufacturer of baby carriages, furniture-making shops, bakeries, a small steel mill, and others. West of this belt, near the center of Blackston, stands a concentrated nucleus of public housing, most of it high-rise in design. Nearly surrounding this focus in a roughly concentric crescent to the north, west, and south are many blocks consisting primarily or entirely of tenements in various stages of disintegration. Beyond, this, particularly to the south and west, stretch a smaller number of blocks occupied mainly by two-family houses, many of them in much better repair. We have only been able to find one single tenement whose owner or apparent owner was anyone but a Euro-American individual or company located outside the community. Many of the two-family dwellings -- possibly as many as half of the total -- are owner-occupied.

The boundaries of the community are generally well agreed upon by residents. On the east it is bounded by a complex of rail lines and freight yards. To the south is a major traffic artery backed by a commercial-industrial strip, a kind of buffer zone between Blackston and Euro-American middle-class areas. The northern and western limits are not quite so sharp, but they are generally understood to coincide with a few wide, thru-traffic boulevards. In all cases except the eastern boundary so sharply delineated by the railroad, the ethnic and class composition of the population changes rather dramatically as one crosses these boundaries.

To the north and northwest of Blackston is a large district where Afro-Americans are a long-established majority, stemming from a settlement of freedmen which apparently goes back at least to the 1820's. English-speaking West Indians are prominent in this area which shows much more class variation than Blackston: some luxurious homes belong to Afro-Americans there, though blocks and blocks of slum also exist nearby. Hispano-Americans appear to be a smaller minority there than in Blackston, and non-Latin Euro-Americans seem to be rare.

The neighboring district with the greatest ethnic variety stretches off to the east of Blackston. It includes numerous long-established Slavs, Italians, and other Euro-Americans, as well as a very recent and rapid influx of Afro-Americans and Latins. Class variation is important there too and appears rather obviously correlated with ethnic groupings. There are indications that fighting clubs or gangs exist in this community, which is not the case in Blackston as far as we have been able to determine.

The area south of Blackston was originally an Italian fishing village. Today it is a middle and upper-middle income, largely White district populated mainly by Italians, East European Jews, and other Euro-Americans. Blacks within the lower-middle-income range live there in small numbers and are apparently nucleated in residential clusters associated with public housing projects. Some hundreds of Blackston teenagers attend a public high school opened in this area a few years ago. From the beginning this school has been a focus of intense racial conflict, breaking out several times in the last two years into large-scale fighting.

West of Blackston stretch several locally differentiated urban districts which together make up the principal Jewish concentration in the metropolitan area. Here live many former residents of Blackston who still own houses, businesses, or both in Blackston. This is another middle-and-upper-middle income area. An Afro-American and Hispano-American influx has begun into the eastern reaches of this area, but this change has not yet penetrated very far.

Crossing the boundary from Blackston into adjacent districts presents the observer with dramatic contrasts, particularly to the west and south. The physical appearance of people on the streets changes abruptly. Much is different in the whole style of street behavior, public communication, and expressiveness. At the same time, overflowing garbagage cans, refuse-stewn sidewalks, and rubbish-heaped vacant lots give way to clean and neat residential blocks. Abruptly there are no more empty shells of abandoned tenements. One does not see fire-gutted ruins standing month after month, outside the community. The streets themselves are suddently free of potholes, and there are few stripped cars to be seen. Yet these middle-class Euro-American neighborhoods are also somehow colorless, uniform, and tense in comparison with the ghetto.

We find that Blackston approximates the definition of community given by Arensberg and Kimball (1965:7-27) in their work on community studies, focused on the thesis that communities are microcosms of both society and culture in complex social systems. In terms of the defining characteristics developed by these authors. Blackston is, first of all, reasonably "representative" of low-income urban Afro-Americans in the United States. This community includes approximately the range of people filling the roles and statuses of age and sex categories, ethnic subdivisions, occupational specializations, income brackets, sacred and secular organizations and institutions generally expected in our Black Ghettos. Apparently the only social element missing is the thin upper-crust elite present in some of the oldest and largest Afro-American communities.

This is, secondly, a fairly "complete" or whole community in the temporal sense that its character, as a structured social field persists through time, despite the entry or exit of particular resident members. This appears to be true even though the current predominance of Afro-American ethnic groups in Blackston is less than two decades old. Afro-Americans have been a minority within the community for a century or more, and there is some continuity from that earlier stage to the present. In the third place, Blackston appears to satisfy Arensberg and Kimball's criterior of "inclusiveness" at least moderately well. Most of the cultural idioms and traits, national organizations and movements, social and political problems generally associated with urban Black Americans are present in one form or another. Fourthly, while there are certainly factions and schisms in this community, Blackston does have a real "cohesiveness" or solidarity. This is expressed not only through informal collective action against certain categories of outsiders, but also through the institutionalized structures and processes of a community council representing over one hundred member organizations.

A quality of this community perhaps most evident in relation to this fourth criterion is, nevertheless, important for all facets of life in Blackston. In spite of the features just mentioned, Blackston does not presently have the fully functional and thoroughly structured unification of many long-established communities. This is because, through a complex interplay of external and internal forces, Blackston is very much in the process of becoming, that is of defining and redefining itself. Far from being a settled, static social entity, this collectivity is being formed and reformed as a multi-ethnic but predominantly Afro-American community. Its people are seeking and attempting to create not only interconnectedness and unity in an organizational sense, but identity in both cultural and psychological senses. In these terms too, Blackston is very much a microcosm of Black America.

4. Poor People With No Culture of Poverty

In the course of this research we have developed a series of hypotheses to be tested against the facts of life in Blackston. Some of these propositions were developed before we came here, but most of them have emerged during our time in the community. Thus far we have three major hypotheses, each associated with a series of derived and supportive propositions. The first of these formulations deals with relationships between poverty and culture. As background against which to view theoretical questions of this order, let us now consider some further descriptive data on the life of the Afro-American poor in Blackston.

Enough was said in the previous section to make clear the general contours of poverty in Blackston as a whole. Here it may be appropriate, however, to focus more sharply on the dimensions of employment, occupation, and income as they are emerging in data from the more intensive and intimate neighborhood-based portion of our ethnographic field work. Here we are working with a population that is some 85% Afro-American in one of the poorer sections of the community. At this level we have found that the detailed phenomena of income and occupation are quite complex and frequently obscure. It appears that under fluctuating and marginal economic conditions the actual sources of general subsistance and occasional surplus become multiple, varied, and rapidly shifting. Among other things, it is difficult to determine the nature of basic economic units under these conditions. From some viewpoints the primary units of economic cooperation appear to be households, while in other contexts they seem to be individual-centered networks. A great meany individuals manage to garner small increments of income from several or numerous different origins. Since quite a few methods of supplementing income are more or less unconventional or extra-legal, resources are frequently manipulated more or less covertly.

The following data are from Afro-American households only. The sample represents approximately 80 families with which we are quite intimately acquainted. Two thirds of them reside in our block, the remainder in the immediately surrounding neighborhood. Within these households, some 120 adults are the major receivers of income. Rather than attempt to tabulate all the origins of their incomes, we list here one principal income source for each individual. The list is arranged according to the number of individuals receiving their primary income from each source. While some individuals shift rather frequently from one way of making a living to another, the resource origins listed below are those which individuals used most over the past year to eighteen months.

NUMBERS OF AFRO-AMERICAN ADULTS RECEIVING PRINCIPAL INCOME
FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

Welfare	45	Neighborhood retailing	4
Factory operative	10	Nurse, nurses aid	4
Guard, janitor, etc.	8	Misc. skilled trades	3
Domestic service	8	School paraprofessional	2
Other service	8	Teacher	1
Office worker	8	Shoe salesman	1
Carpenter, construction	7	Policeman	1
Truck driver	5	Minister	1
Cab driver	4	TOTAL	120

Within this sample, some 38% receive their principal monetary resources from welfare programs including aid to dependent children, unemployment compensation, social security, and compensation for disability. Approximately 20% earn their incomes primarily from low-skilled service occupations. Blue collar occupations account for nearly half (46%) of the total or about 70% of all individuals whose major expendable resources come from conventional employment. The commonest means of supplementing these basic income resources include partial, supplementary welfare payments, gambling, gifts and loans from kinsmen and other network associates, miscellaneous neighborhood service and odd jobs. Minors are excluded from the above tabulation because very few have regular or steady incomes of their own. Probably 90% of teenagers are either in school or dropouts who work very irregularly. A substantial minority control some resources through the stolen-goods trade, but a majority receive their major support either from the earnings of parents or through welfare aid to dependents.

Among the tabulated individuals, about three quarters of those receiving substantial welfare support are women who get aid for dependent children, ostensibly because they have no other means of subsistence for their children. A substantial majority of these women, however, are actually using ADC together with other but grossly inadequate resources. Many of them receive whatever small support is possible from various categories of kinsmen and other connections either within or outside their households. All the listed domestic servants are middle-aged women, while the other service occupations are all rather menial jobs held by men. All eight of the white-collar office workers are females of the younger generation, mostly clerks and typists not many years out of high school. Aside from the handful of professionals and semi-professionals, those who receive the most substantial wages are the carpenters, construction workers, truck drivers, and the few other skilled tradesmen, even though many of them do not belong to unions.

Because of the complexity and partly covert nature of the income situation, we have chosen not to probe deeply in this area with many people during the early part of our study. Consequently, we do not have large amounts of income data to report at this stage. We do have a smaller number of well documented household budgets and strong broader impressions consistent with them. On this basis we currently believe that three main levels of income typify most households in the community as a whole.

TYPICAL FAMILY INCOME

Source	Annual Amount	Individuals Supported	Per Capita Annual Income
Welfare only	$ 4,296	1 adult, 4 children	$ 859
Wages only	9,360	2 adults, 5 children	1,337
Wages supplemented by welfare	12,768	2 adults, 6 children	1,596

Many more households are in the first two brackets than the third. In interpreting these figures it should be born in mind that in 1968 the per capita income of the state where Blackston is located as over $4,000 (Kurtz 1969:179). Official estimates have recently suggested that the income needed for a minimum adequate standard of living in the metropolis which includes Blackston is $6,000 for a family of four, or a per capita figure of $1,500. The above figures can also be compared with the fact that average annual household income in the city surrounding Blackston stands above $14,000 (Kurtz 1969:427). Two obvious inferences from these data somewhat balance one another, and both are supported by our general experience in the community. First, very few people are totally destitute here. Secondly, for most citizens it is impossible to receive an adequate income without combining both wages and welfare or other resources.

Even though Blackston is in a state with one of the highest levels of public assistance payments in the nation, these resources are still seriously inadequate. Under the commonest form of welfare, aid to dependent children, it works out to approximately $30 per month for each child, plus rent. (Since rents for even very dilapidated four and five-room apartments commonly range up to $160 per month and sometimes even higher, it is apparent that the welfare system functions as a subsidy for landlords.) This frequently means that as much as two-fifths of a family's welfare income must go into rent. This can be compared with the fact that the Bureau of Labor Statistics' workers' family budget allocates less than 20% for housing in most cities and the actual median national figure for this is under 15% (Kurtz 1969:423). When it is realized that each welfare-supported child's other needs are supplied at a rate of roughly one dollar per day, it becomes apparent why families cannot live decently or healthily on ADC alone. Aside from welfare payments, the only other commonly available forms of basic public assistance are free treatment for some but not all health problems and rather small amounts of surplus food.

With a single category of exceptions, we find very little refusal to work or voluntary idleness, either among welfare recipients or elsewhere in the community. The exception consists of young school dropouts who decline to accept or at least to stick at the demeaning and minimally paid jobs which are typically all they can find. Most adults who receive their income entirely or mainly from the welfare system are either women with child rearing responsibilities which would not allow them to take jobs or individuals of either sex who do not work for reasons of age and health. If health reasons are extended to include alcoholism and drug addiction, the remaining individuals who live just on welfare in preference to any kind of gainful pursuit must be very small indeed. The myth of the lazy welfare profiteer finds little support here. This does not mean that no one profits from public assistance in ways that are inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the welfare laws and regulations. When such requirements are evaded or manipulated, however, it is generally by individuals who are quite actively and energetically engaged in making as good a living as they can manage.

Most households that are supported entirely by wages include two or more individuals with steady jobs. A typical pattern consists of a husband who works at a trade like carpentering or truck driving, a wife who is in domestic service or factory work, and sometimes one or two teenage children with part-time jobs. As can be seen from the last table, such families are materially better off in terms of expendable resources per person than welfare households. Yet they are still poor and can seldom fulfill their aspirations. Many of these families own a home, a car, and some amount of life insurance. Yet their mortagages are heavy and not infrequently are foreclosed, the houses may be in very poor condition, and the auto will be old and often out of running order. Particularly when the household includes a good many children, incomes in this bracket generally are far from sufficient to maintain steadily the desired standards of ownership and consumption. This means that many such families are chronically in debt and that they often lose property in which they have invested considerable funds. This is a struggle at a different level than that of the welfare-only budget, but given the standards of aspiration involved it is hardly less of a struggle.

It is quite difficult to make sense of the local situation in terms of conventional concepts of unemployment. If only those who are demonstrably seeking actively for a job without success are counted, the unemployment rate is probably not much higher here than it is nationally for nonwhites (about double the rate for Whites). On the other hand, if we include individuals who have given up trying to get employment, those wo do not believe any job they want is available to them, and those who get menial jobs but leave them frequently in dissatisfaction, the rate would be very much higher. Moreover, using these categories at least three quarters of all teenagers could be considered unemployed. There is also a good deal of temporary, erratic, or unpredictable employment among those who do have jobs.

The economics of inequality are, of course, not a matter of income alone. Economic poverty involves a relationship between disposable resources and the cost of living. It is therefore significant that very often the people of Blackston must pay more for the same commodity or service than residents of Euro-American districts in the same city. Some of the data we have collected on this problem are summarized in the following table. The figures shown here represent price levels obtained from spot checks of representative merchants who sell food and everyday household necessities. Within the community prices were observed first in three small, independent neighborhood stores which are the most accessible retail outlets for most citizens. The second group of establishments observed consists of three supermarkets within the community. Finally, observations were made in three more supermarkets located outside in predominantly nonblack middle-class areas within a mile or two of Blackston. Two of the three outside stores are owned by the same chains as two of the supermarkets observed inside the community.

In all cases the items priced were kept as strictly comparable as possible. With respect to brand-name products, for example, care was taken to price the same brand in each retail outlet. The twenty commodities priced at each outlet all represent common items of daily subsistence in Blackston. Some foods that are common in Blackston diets, such as chitterlings and pinto beans, had to be excluded because they are unobtainable in many Euro-American stores. In the tabulation, all observed outlets within the community -- whether small groceries or lage chain stores -- are lumped together, in order to highlight the contrasts across community lines. Within the ghetto it is generally true that supermarket prices are somewhat lower than neighborhood grocery prices, but this is neither so great nor so consistent a difference as the contrast between communities.

COMMERCIAL RETAIL PRICES

Product	A Average Price in White Areas	B Average Price in Blackston	Difference Between A & B In Percent
Meat and eggs			
Stew beef	92¢ lb.	94¢ lb.	+ 2
Pork ribs	89¢ lb.	93¢ lb.	+ 4
Chicken	39¢ lb.	53¢ lb.	+36
Neck bones	31¢ lb.	36¢ lb.	+16
Medium eggs	75¢ doz.	84¢ doz.	+12
Dairy & Bakery Products			
Whole milk	32¢ qt.	30¢ qt.	- 6
White break	33¢ loaf	33¢ loaf	0
Vegetables			
Collards (frozen)	18¢ pkg.	25¢ pkg.	+39
String beans (frozen)	22¢ pkg.	25¢ pkg.	+14
Brocooli (frozen)	28¢ pkg.	39¢ pkg.	+39
Rice	26¢ lb.	42¢ lb.	+61
Tomatoes	30¢ pkg.	33¢ pkg.	+10
Fruit			
Oranges	5¢ ea.	8¢ ea.	+60
Apples	14¢ lb.	25¢ lb.	+79
Bananas	15¢ lb.	16¢ lb.	+ 7
Beverages			
Beer	$1.26 6-pack	$1.33 6-pack	+ 6
Soda	.95 6-pack	1.00 6-pack	+ 5
Non-food Items			
Detergent	28¢ lb.	37¢ lb.	+32
Bath soap	11¢ cake	14¢ cake	+27
Toilet paper	14¢ role	15¢ role	+ 7
Average difference			+23%

It can be seen that the prices cited here suggest an aggregate difference in food and other household costs of nearly 25%, which of course means a substantial addition to the burden of poverty. With popular items such as chicken and rice ranging from over a third to above 60% more in ghetto stores, the problem takes on still great proportions. With widely like fruits priced nearly up to 80% more, this marketing system may have considerable nutritional effect. The chart also shows that possibilities for economizing by selecting certain foods are limited, since in twenty basic items only one (milk) shows a slight price difference favorable to ghetto shoppers. Moreover, there are other significant contrasts not shown by the figures. Stores outside the Black community offer generally higher quality merchandise and greater variety in brands, prices, and packaged quantities. Spoiled meat, wilted vegetables, and sour milk are common in Blackston, rare in nearby middle-class areas. In the latter locales we have seen eggs nearly double the size of those available in our neighborhood but selling at exactly the same price.

Blackston citizens are well aware of these patterns. Consequently, they take what opportunities they can to travel outside the community for shopping. Possibilities along these lines, however, are limited by distances, time available, transportation costs, the unfamiliarity of outside areas, coolness or hostility from shokkeepers and customers in other communities. Similar patterns also exist in other aspects of local marketing: furniture, appliances, clothing, and so on. Such discriminatory price systems and marketing practices have been widely demonstrated in many other poverty districts inhabited by Afro-Americans (cf. Caplovitz 1963).

In sum, the evidence coming in is confirming our belief that Blackston is representative of low-income Afro-American communities. This makes the community an appropriate source of data against which to test our initial hypothesis. This formulation was developed before we began our field work, and we predicted at that time that it would be contradicted by the data from Blackston.

Hypothesis 1: *The collective behavior and social life of the community conform to a "culture of poverty"* (defined in the works of Oscar Lewis, et. al.) *which is supported by distinctive socialization patterns and which in turn perpetuates the condition of being poor* (cf. Valentine 1968a:127-140). Following the poverty-culture school of thought, Proposition 1.1 states that community members do not participate in the major institutions of society because they are culturally conditioned to avoid, neglect, or fail in such participation. Next comes Proposition 1.2: people of the community have knowledge of mainstream values, but those values are ignored or contradicted in their behavior, again because of distinctive socialization. Proposition 1.3: local social structure is practically non-existent beyond the level of household. 1.4. Family structure and process are unstable and disorganized. 1.5. Personal identity, character, and world view are weak, disorganized, and restricted.

The prediction that the data would be inconsistent with these statements has been substantially fulfilled by the research thus far, with no significant body of evidence yet suggesting otherwise. While we shall continue to be alert to the possibility of contrasting data on these questions, at this point these issues appear to be essentially settled. The tentative conclusion has to be that there is no "culture of poverty" in Blackston. The question arises whether the notion of a poverty culture is at all relevant to Afro-American life. The indications on this question thus far appear negative.

Proposition 1.1 states that the poor are culturally conditioned not to participate in the major institutions of the larger society. Our Blackston data are consistently at odds with this generalization. Leaving aside questions of causation for the moment, let us consider first the evidence with respect to actual levels of institutional participation. In general, our evidence shows that participation in institutional areas varies significantly from one type of institution to another. Much of this data is summarized in the following table of 40 institutional areas arranged according to four degrees of participation.

INSTITUTIONAL AREAS OF PARTICIPATION

High Participation

Welfare system
Blue-collar crime
Police, courts, prison
Poverty programs
Unconventional churches
Primary education
Ethnic retail markets
Ethnic communications media
Neighborhood retailing
National holidays

Medium High Participation

Armed services
Public recreation
Mass transit
Public health services
Mass retail markets
Mass communications media
National sports
National fashions
Conventional churches
Local and metropolitan politics
Ethnic holidays

Medium Low Participation

Property ownership
Credit and finance
Private health services
Private transportation
Luxury retail market
Secondary education
State and national politics
Libraries and museums
Veterans programs

Low Participation

Employment
Labor unions
Higher education
Professional associations
National charities
White-collar crime
Business ownership
Family planning
National sodalities
Specialized occupations

By differences in participation we mean primarily relative proportions of the population observably associated with institutional activities, as well as relative degrees of manifest interest or involvement. The implicit standard underlying the comparative ratings is an approximation of typical White middle-class patterns. For example, placing property ownership under medium-low participation and assigning employment to the "low" column, of course, does not mean that more people own real estate than hold jobs, nor does it indicate that property-holding is more important in low-income economics than employment. What it does mean is that our population differs less from middle-class norms in its real-property ownership patterns than it does in its employment behavior: that is, a surprisingly large number of poor people hold titles to various kinds of homes and land. Another way to translate the rating categories is: "high" means greater participation than is generally found in the White middle class; "medium high," about the same as middle-strata norms; "medium low," somewhat less involvement or access than among majority middle-income populations; "low participation," much less than the selected standard.

By the welfare system we mean the entire diverse governmental apparatus which provides income equivalents in the form of money, commodities, and services. The system itself is incredibly corrupt, burdened with mismanagement and inefficiency to a fantastic degree, notoriously unreliable, and enormously complex and obscure. A great many poor people put much energy and ingenuity into getting all they can from this apparatus, both by individual maneuvers and through the Welfare Rights Movement. The resulting rewards are not very great. Most welfare recipients supplement their income from any of a wide variety of other sources, many of which are technically illicit in terms of the official rules of the system. If those who benefit indirectly are included, there can be little doubt that a majority of our Afro-American population, and perhaps of the whole community, gain some portion of their livelihood from the welfare system. Every check day truly galvanizes Blackston, first with expectation, then with delayed commercial and credit transactions, and finally with celebrations. (Also merchants' prices often go up for a few days.)

Organized crime operates here mainly in the form of the numbers game, the narcotics traffic, and to a lesser extent car-stealing operations. Again most of the population is involved to one degree or another. Playing the numbers is by far the commonest form of involvement. Virtually everyone comes into some form of at least indirect contact with these operations. At least minimal knowledge of their existence is essentially universal beyond early childhood. Very few individuals appear to have any involvement beyond being customers of extremely minor servants of these operations. It is not mainly these pursuits which make participation in the police-court-prison complex such a common fact of life here. It is usually other activities which lead to experience of this complex: freelance thievery against business establishments, many forms of minor public delinquency, domestic quarrels and street fights, protest demonstrations and other affronts to official authority. The police are everywhere, generally high handed, frequently brutal. Delinquents also are numerous and often quite daring. Apart from the major illegal operations protected by payoffs, there are several other categories of proscribed behavior about which the police do little or nothing, including muggings of ghetto residents and burglary of ghetto homes.

Merchandise generally known by both buyer and seller to be stolen goods plays an important part in the local economy. Such goods come from many sources, local and distant, amateur and professional. An enormous variety of commodities is involved here: food, clothing, jewelry, toys, furniture, appliances, fuel oil, automobiles and auto parts, cigarettes, liquor, and others. Not all items are sold, for when looting occasionally produces sudden surpluses neighborhoods may revel in general sharing. More generally, however, sale is involved whether in bulk (usually to White or extra-community persons) or item by item within the neighborhoods. Prices are variable and open to considerable negotiation, but it is not unusual to save a third or a half compared with regular retail charges. Some, probably many, small shopkeepers buy purloined merchandise in quantity and resell it at their usual rates. Many, probably a substantial majority, of adult citizens, at least occasionally purchase such goods directly, as they are peddled through the neighborhoods. It is not possible to give more than a very rough idea of the volume of this trade, but it is not a large proportion of total consumer expenditures. With respect to direct purchases outside commercial establishments at any rate, an educated guess is that stolen commodities seldom represent more than ten per cent of a family's routine expenditures for consumer goods. What makes this trade conspicuous in the local economy, then, is its ubiquity rather than its scale.

In the midst of all this are some extremely widespread patterns that are positively genteel by comparison. One of the most striking of these is the practice of individual salesmanship within the neighborhood, often ceremonialized as home entertainment, in service of a considerable variety of mail-order businesses. Several of these involve quite elaborate secular rituals, such as women's parties at which orders are solicited and guests are persuaded to get further involved by sponsoring further parties. Within our own block alone, the co-principal investigator has been invited to well over a dozen of these occasions in a few months. She estimates that at least 75% of the young adult and mature females in the block have been involved in this traffic during this period. Goods offered consist mainly of kitchen and household items, cosmetics, and clothing. Suppliers include major national companies, such as Tupperware and Avon. Individual orders on single occasions range up to $40 and $50.

In elementary public schooling and the local anti-poverty agency, there is widespread public participation, particularly by North American Blacks. The popularity of such involvement waxes and wanes in accordance with local developments, issues, and grievances. During a long teacher's strike citizen involvement in the schools of our neighborhood, particularly among Blacks, was maintained at a high level, and though it has fallen off since then it has by no means disappeared. In one neighborhood where a measure of community control over schools has been achieved, a high degree of parental participation has been maintained for two years. Since that neighborhood is not essentially different from the rest of Blackston, it may be suspected that a similar level of sustained interest and activity might well develop if the special circumstances of local control were duplicated elsewhere in the community. Spanish-Americans appear to have shown their greatest potential along these lines in the one neighborhood school which has a Puerto Rican principal and a real bilingual program for pupils.

Every major national holiday is celebrated most widely here with many parties, much visiting, and family trips to public recreational facilities. All the commercialized accompaniments of these celebrations, from greeting cards to seasonal fashions, are matters of great attention and interest. All this is no doubt tied into the constant exposure to mass marketing and mass communications. The information and entertainment presented by the national communications industry receive attention, commentary, and discussion that would appear to rival the response of most middle-class communities. Contrary to some generalizations about poor people, our neighbors patronize supermarkets, department stores, and other mass retailers very often. Nationally projected fads and fashions in areas as diverse as clothing, dance steps, and children's toys are followed avidly.

The situation in our block with respect to real property appears to illustrate a pattern widely distributed in the community with some variations. About half of this block is made up of multiple-apartment tenements, the remainder being two-family houses, many of them owner-occupied. Since most of the resident owners are quite poor, their ownership involves them in multiple, complex, and often obscure relationships with real estate agencies, banks and other credit sources, and legal practitioners. Many people who regularly rent their living quarters here say they own property elsewhere, generally in the South or in the Caribbean. General purpose credit cards are not altogether rare, a good many families have various kinds of bank accounts, and many of the very poorest people possess commercial insurance policies.

Prevailing patterns in another economic area are quite clear. Probably the single national institution in which Afro-American participation is most notably lacking is conventional entrepreneurship. All major commercial concerns and industrial enterprises in Blackston appear to be owned and managed by non-resident Whites. All but a tiny scattering of small businesses are operated by proprietors from the marginal Italian and Jewish remnants, the long-established Arab minority, or Latin Americans. Two locally important examples illustrate the general pattern. Among the many dozens of small groceries, the vast majority are run by Spanish-speakers, and we have yet to discover one under Afro-American control. There are well over fifty liquor stores in this community, and a combination of observation with expert informant testimony indicates that no more than three of these are even nominally owned by Afro-Americans. On the other hand, a good many Black Americans are active and apparently more or less successful in less conventional types of business and commercial enterprise. These include bootlegging liquor, operating informal but sometimes profitable neighborhood gambling establishments, and managing the enormous traffic in "hot" items with its astonishing array of offerings. Who may actually be said to "own" such enterprises or provide the capital for them is frequently most obscure and difficult to determine.

Let us now turn to the question of causes underlying these various forms of differential institutional participation. Can the emerging pattern best be explained in terms of distinctive socialization and enculturation in a poor people's way of life or better by another model? This is closely related to the issue embodied in Proposition 1.2, namely whether mainstream or middle-class values of the larger society have any motivating influence on behavior among the poor, or whether their distinctive behavior rather stems from a separate lower-class value system. Proposition 1.5 is similarly implicated here: Is it true in the population under study that individual character, personality, and world view are weak, disorganized, and restricted? Or do we find rather that cognitive and affective orientations are predominantly realistic and adaptive within externally imposed limits?

We have found many indications that the patterns of relatively high participation in mainstream institutional complexes are supported by socialization patterns, expressed values, and motivating personality factors quite comparable to those that are familiar from middle class communities. Role models from such diverse mainstream sources as television, public schools, and national church denominations all play an important part in local socialization. This is true not only with respect to explicit instruction by parents and other neighborhood or community authorities, but also in the informal give and take of daily social intercourse through which people unintentionally but continually communicate culture patterns. These various media all repeatedly introduce into everyone's experience such conventional models as the successful school child, the concerned school parent, the well dressed person, the successful hostess, the knowledgeable sports fan, the well equipped householder, the competent amateur mechanic, home cook, or neighborhood musician, and many more.

The sanctions supporting these patterns range from formal awards and demerits in schools and community organizations, through the compliments and insults of neighborhood intercourse and gossip, to rewards and punishments meted out by household seniors and authorities. In many of the areas of high conventional participation, moreover, there is every indication that people are held back from still higher participation by lack of resources and limited access to many institutional settings. We have no doubt that if they had more money our neighbors would buy and use more standard consumer goods. There can be little doubt that freer access to meaningful participation in the schools would bring about greater public involvement. Another indication of devotion to conventional educational values emerged when a lengthening teachers' strike made it appear that local schools would be closed and strife-torn for a long while: a considerable number of parents sent their children to live with relatives elsewhere, mostly in the South, where they could attend undisturbed schools.

With respect to high participation in institutional complexes that are atypical or unconventional from a middle-class standpoint, the situation is more complicated but perhaps not much different in its sociopsychological essentials. The principal added complication is that everyone knows overt mainstream values condemn or at least denigrate these activities. Among all the very many people we know who are more or less deeply involved in proscribed behavior, there are very few if any whom we could describe as either unaware or unmindful of the conventional prohibitionist values and the standard sanctions attached to them. Some at least of the countervailing motivations which lead people to behave in these ways despite such awareness and concern are clear and can be specified.

Most prominent here is the very commitment to mainstream consumptive patterns discussed earlier, combined with insufficient income. It is certainly clear that in many instances where this combination operates, the low level of income is determined by structural conditions quite beyond the individual's control. These include the general scarcity of approved occupational niches, past and present confinement of minority groups to the poorest educational facilities, a sliding scale of ethnic discrimination by employers on which North American Blacks generally occupy the bottom position, similar forms of discrimination by sources of credit, exclusionism in the labor movement, prohibition of worker organizations by institutions employing disproportionate numbers of low-skilled and low-paid minority people, and the typical ghetto complex of exploitation by entrepreneurs who charge higher prices for lower quality and poorer service. Each of these conditions exists in quite blatant form throughout Blackston and in many of the available employment contexts outside the community. There is a very widespread awareness of these conditions, particularly among Afro-Americans, which leads to a general sense of victimization with very strong ethnic overtones.

The interplay of attitudes, values, motives, and behavior which is associated with all this is not easy to capsulize. One shorthand description which has occurred to us repeatedly may convey some of the quality of life here. One feels that there is a less intense but continuous play of the same dynamic which shows itself to the outside world only in the brief explosions of ghetto insurrections. Rioting and looting (which have occurred here but only on a relatively small scale during our research) express ethnic grievances and protest against structural conditions like those just cited. Far from expressing a separate cultural system, however, they arise in significant part from the very experience of simultaneous commitment to mainstream values (from concrete consumptive needs to abstractions like equality) and frustration in attempts to achieve and enjoy the rewards traditionally associated with living by these values. Rioters and looters are perfectly well aware of the values and sanctions opposed to their violent activities, and throughout most of their lives, except for brief explosions, their behavior has been consistent with the internalized restraints and community social control that are integrated with this value system. Moreover, mainstream values themselves include positive approval of many forms of violence and numerous other suspensions of proscriptions under a wide variety of extreme conflict situations. Ghetto people are by no means unaware of this latitude.

In a somewhat lower key, quite comparable factors interact continually in the lives of many people here, including of course large numbers who have never taken part in a riot or committed any comparable individual act of open defiance against conventional authority. Taking all one can get licitly or otherwise from the welfare system, partaking in the flow of stolen goods, enjoying the pleasures of illegal gambling, and the like are very widely treated as ways of achieving conventional satisfactions which are legitimate in the absence of alternative means to the same ends. More conventional alternative means are generally accepted as preferable but regarded as at least temporarily unattainable. Morever, local forms of contradiction betwen values and behavior overlap significantly with common middle-class and classless derelictions: systematic violation of speed limits and parking regulartions, purposeful cheating of the revenue service, pious dedication in public (and particularly in ceremonial contexts) to all manner of high principals that are otherwise mainly honored in the breach.

Few people who buy from the stolen-goods market are free of ambivalence about it. Most believe that the trade is morally objectionable, but other priorities motivate them to participate in spite of this belief. For many it is primarily a matter of spending small incomes as advantageously as possible. A common formulation is that regardless of moral questions about the source of the merchandise, one only hurts oneself, ones family, and ones children by not taking advantage of it. Another expression of conflict in values is the pattern of adults who openly support the trade by frequent purchases but severely punish their children if the latter become involved in the traffic, especially in the stealing end of it. Men who are heavily involved in burglary, hijacking, and so forth sometimes formulate the issues more elaborately. One such formulation states that stealing from a brother in the ghetto is deeply wrong because people here have so little through no fault of their own; but taking from rich men or companies whose possessions are heavily insured is of no moral consequence because the victim will not really suffer any significant loss. A man may add that such activities are particularly blameless if the thief works hard at the best job he can get and only steals because his wages are not enough to support his family. This may be accompanied by considerable philosophizing to the effect that it is just your job to get the stuff and not be caught, while it is the policeman's job to catch you, and the police also are not to be blamed, for they too are only doing what they have to do to get by.

Attitudes somewhat akin to these seem to be latent in a considerable proportion of the local population. Certain rather dramatic events testify to this. We have observed several occasions when a few hundred youngsters converged in a lighthearted and jubilant crowd on a target like a freight yard in broad daylight. Such groups included many girls as well as boys and quite a few children as young as six or seven. Opening the freight cars and struggling with bulky cartons, the youngsters laughed and shouted as they made off with their booty. Such an event speedily alerts the neighborhood, and crowds of adults and older teenagers often gather to watch. Some parents chastize their children and drag them off, but most adults make no attempt to interfere. Many comment with jovial amusement on the scene. Gradually even spectators who express deep disapproval of stealing and looting in other contexts are caught up in the atmosphere of celebration. They take on almost the air of a crowd watching a hometown high school football team winning against arch rivals. When a few police eventually arrive and vainly try to chase the hordes of youngsters away, the spectators tend to respond with more merriment as if the officers are merely an added element in the cast of the pageant. By evening there is hardly a household in the neighborhood that has not received a bonanza of onions, or toy trucks, or whatever was in the freight cars that day!

Incidents like the following are so commonplace as to be a regular part of the fabric of life here. A poor family is giving a rather festive dinner, which they can hardly afford, for a few visitors who are close associates living in the same block. In the midst of dinner comes an unexpected visit from two adults well known to everyone present. They bring a quantity of food freshly stolen from a warehouse, intending to distribute shares among their personal network which includes most of those present at the dinner party. There ensues an earnest and contentious discussion of the morality of receiving stolen goods. Eventually the host family accepts its share. One guest declines her share and berates the givers for immoral behavior, though it is openly known that she herself regularly patronizes bootleggers, the numbers game, and other illegal enterprises.

Another typical incident involves two middle-aged North American Black men who live across the street from one another but do not know each other well. Each one heads a large household, has worked steadily at the same job for many years, frequently attends fundamentalist church services, constantly expresses and behaves in accordance with many mainstream values. Because he has a friend who badly needs an auto seat, one of these men wrestles long and hard, fully in the public eye, to detach a seat from a partly stripped stolen auto on the street. The other man, watching all this, expresses astonishment and deep disapproval that his little-known but apparently most respectable neighbor would do such a thing. We know this moralizer well enough to be reasonably sure that he has not stripped cars himself, but we are quite certain from observation that he regularly indulges in other conventionally illicit pursuits for his own and his family's profit and enjoyment. Some of these are illegal activities specifically urged upon him by his middle-class employers, similar to examples given below.

Many poor people here are directly aware of behavior by middle-and upper-class groups which is grossly inconsistent with overt mainstream values. A good many of these patterns can be followed only by people with statuses and resources unavailable to the poor, and some of these practices contribute directly to victimization of the local populace. Among the most dramatic examples are corruption, brutality, laziness, and capricious unpredictability among the police. Regular payoffs to police officers by unlicensed and other illegal businesses are one of the biggest open secrets in the community. Experience with police beatings is sufficiently widespread so that individual cases excite little comment; police shootings are less common and more unpredictable. Locations where officers sleep in patrol cars while on duty are well known; one happens to be in an abandoned block which we have observed many times. We have had occasion to watch patrolmen casually observe neighborhood boys engaged in such activities as car-stripping, and do nothing about it. We have also observed four instances of looting on a considerable scale which were openly allowed by the police, possibly in collusion with owners who stood to receive large insurance payments. Though we have never observed this, it is generally believed that policemen apprehending local people with stolen goods often take the goods for themselves and let the miscreants go; we have received many highly detailed accounts of such incidents from individuals who say they were participants or eye witnesses.

Other forms of callous, self-seeking, and ethnically discriminatory behavior, in blatant disregard of official middle-class and institutional norms, are matters of common experience with respect to health professionals, court officers and employees, correctional and penal personnel, not to mention landlords, merchants, or creditors, and their numerous agents. Some of the most systematic forms of corruption and hypocrisy have long been passed quite directly down the class ladder, by example, through the older political machines. More recently this has been supplemented and now overshadowed by a vast growth of newer mechanisms employed by city hall (not to mention federal agencies) to deal with ghettos. Those reaching into our chosen community include various intelligence operations and a broad spectrum of other programs designed to head off insurrections. The tangle of concealed payrolls, hidden or unidentified payments, undiscussed duties and functions, guarded identities, private political agendas, and more or less under-cover activities in all this is indeed an elaborate and obscure complex. This complex is less well know to ordinary citizens than the other patterns mentioned, but many people active in the local power system and various community programs are deeply enmeshed in it. All this provides a whole series of avenues to hoped-for upward mobility, each of which at the same time involves substantial inconsistency with major overt or official value-premises of mainstream society.

Another quite important context in which local people experience and interact with behavior patterns of the middle and upper classes is domestic service. This is one of the commonest female occupations here, especially for Afro-Americans native to the U. S. Here again is another major opportunity for the poor to learn much about the discrepancies between overt and covert culture patterns among affluent Americans. This is made possible in part by the peculiar forms of intimacy, with all their overtones of patronage and exploitation, between employers and employees in this field. Service workers may thus become privy to a good many indiscretions, derelictions and failings by their masters which are by no means public knowledge: personal pathologies and weaknesses, family conflicts, sexual aberrations, financial manipulations, legal maneuverings, and so forth.

Beyond this, however, there is a significant amount of direct tutoring in upper-status customs for violating official morality and evading associated santions, techniques which are often less well known and sometimes frowned upon in the ghetto. We have quite a variety of records of employers inveigling their servants into playing some part in their own illicit enterprises, informing employees of new ways for them to get around laws and regulations, and urging them to avail themselves of various benefits to which they are not strictly entitled. Specific cases involve tax dodges, income falsification for other purposes, ways of receiving public assistance without satisfying the prescribed qualifying conditions, and the like. In some instances, domestics and their families have declined to do what was requested or suggested, because they believe it is wrong. Others probably refuse because they fear being apprehended and punished by officialdom. This is connected with yet another widespread local perception of life in higher strata, namely that comfortable and rich people, committing the same or similar violations of official norms as the poor, are much less likely to suffer any unpleasant sanctions against their behavior.

There is thus considerable evidence that many of the seamier sides of mainstream life are at least as well known here as its official values, role models, institutional charters, and so forth. Since so much of this seamier side resembles the high participation of ghetto dwellers in conventionally disapproved behavior, the middle class does not look so different from this perspective. The major differences which are not reduced, in this view upward from the ghetto, are the contrasts in economic resources controlled, power wielded, skills available, and institutional accesses guaranteed. Now it may well be that our local populace is exposed to a somewhat specialized sample of middle-class patterns. Some Blackstonians are explicitly aware that Afro-Americans have a body of specialized knowledge in this area; it is sometimes said that "we need this for our own protection." Indeed it does appear that much of the behavior in question occurs more openly and blatantly when there is no one around to witness it (or suffer from it) but the minority poor. It is a suggestive possibility that it may be easier for the average middle-class person to avoid knowledge and maintain ignorance of the derelictions and discrepancies within his own class than it is for many ghetto-dwellers to avoid experience of the same patterns among their social superiors.

Most people here, between early childhood and old age, have strong aspirations to enjoy the fruits and pleasures of higher-strata life. These aspirations are not by any means confined to, or even focussed upon, ambitions to practice the covert forms of self-aggrandizement among the affluent and the powerful. Nor are these merely verbal patterns of lipservice to ideals with no influence on behavior. One common pattern is exemplified by families who manage to construct a highly plausible imitation of a fashionable middle-class home within a vermin-infested tenement apartment or a multiple-mortgaged two-family house which may well be physically unsound. Another is careful personal care lavished on low-priced automobiles. Lots of energy is expended on inculcating conventional courtesies, good grooming, and the like in children, and much pride is evident in the results.

A more largely verbal and negative reflection of similar sentiments and valuations is so prominent as to appear virtually universal. One cannot live through an ordinary day in the company of local citizens without hearing people express the wish to leave Blackston, accompanied by a catalogue of the community's deficiencies and unsolved problems. These complaints, often down to details of phraseology, sound remarkably like a recitation of the very evils the middle class feels it has escaped and against which it seems determined to defend itself. The dreary list includes congested living conditions, substandard housing, general filth and physical disorder, high rates of delinquency and crime, high incidence of alcoholism and narcotics addiction, inadequate public services, poor schools, lack of civic mindedness and community spirit, and so on.

Besides generalized disapproval, other attitudes and beliefs about these community conditions run much the same gamut one would expect to find among comfortable majority populations. The most commonly voiced diagnosis of local social ills invokes low ambition, lack of effort, failure to take advantage of opportunites, selfishness, disunity, immorality, and personal weakness as general characteristics of the local populace. So deeply ingrained are these mainstream evaluations of ones own community, ones neighbors, and frequently oneself, that it is no exaggeration to describe them as constituting a massive communal inferiority complex. Less often one hears problems blamed on public authorities, civil servants, or political power holders. Despite widespread passive interest in Black advancement causes, outright espousal of radical social and political analyses by nationalist or revolutionary spokesmen and organizations occurs only among a minority. Even moderate reformist action groups find these attitudes a major problem. Another very common orientation is superficially inconsistent with the dominant diagnosis just described. This is a large measure of easy-going tolerance toward perceived human weaknesses, often an amused or indulgent acceptance of otherwise condemned behavior. Such tolerance is perhaps a psychologically necessary adaptation to a combination of circumstances and feelings that might otherwise become intolerable.

This whole complex of value commitments, experience patterns, and identity problems seems to show a fundamental cultural allegiance which can be squared with massive concrete experience only at the expense of widespread individual and group self-denigration. Many variations of self-blame, softened with tolerance toward inadequacy, appear to offer a less painful alternative than believing that the frustrations of ghetto existence are really maintained by external agencies which are known to be quite intractable and entirely beyond local control or influence. This complex leads to some rather strikingly unrealistic patterns of cognition and affect. A recurrent example which has impressed us many times over is in the field of public education. Most parents have been exposed to repeated instances of clear evidence that many teachers, administrators, and other professionals in the schools are incompetent, uninterested in the children, and more or less grossly lacking in dedication to the official purposes of their institutions. In some contexts, parents make it quite clear spontaneously that they are fully aware of all this and of its probable relationship to low performance and general lack of success by pupils. Yet by far the overwhelming and continually repeated judgement they express is that children do poorly in school because they don't try and because parents don't encourage them. Of course, educators and school authorities constantly reinforce this self-abnegation for their own reasons. Yet our evidence indicates strongly that the denial of experience and the choice of self-blame would exist without this particular reinforcement.

There is in all this nothing to support the idea of a separate cultural system of the poor as such. On the contrary, what is impressive is the degree to which standard mainstream patterns, values, role models, goals, and institutional standards prevail in the consciousness and motivation of ghetto dwellers. We can also find little in prevailing socialization patterns themselves which alone would be expected to lead to distinctive forms or incidences of psychological incapacity, disorganization, or pathology. What does appear to produce substantial psychological problems is the sharp conflict between commitment to mainstream culture and the structural and circumstantial barriers to achieving the goals so highly valued in that culture. Our interpretation is that this conflict leads to unrealistic perceptions and inappropriate affect which are psychologically superficial but behaviorally significant -- producing much unnecessary self-blame, indecisiveness, vacillation, apathy, and inertia.

To summarize, our findings to date indicate that Blackstonians' distinctive experiences with the larger institutions are influenced by three main factors, rather than any poverty culture. These factors are the material condition of poverty itself, mainstream culture, and separate ethnic cultures. The majority of institutional participation patterns are clearly conditioned by the brute fact of people being poor. When occupations are limited and income is minimal for whatever reasons, people turn to other available sources of sustenance: welfare, crime, poverty programs, military service, and the peculiarly exploitive forms of credit and ownership open to the poor. At the same time, mainstream values of American culture are fully understood and receive such general allegiance that they are the main motivation for many highly popular activities. These range from home-based retailing of mass consumption items, to public education and cultural institutions open to the public, commercial offerings of the mass communications media, commercialized holidays, sports, and fashions. Ethnic subcultural identification, to be explored in the next section, plays a decisive role in the selection of certain ethnically tailored allegiances. These range from cultural and political group membership through religious affiliation to consumption patterns such as specialized food products, items for personal adornment, and the available media for artistic expression and enjoyment.

Another favorite generalization of the class-culture school of thought was earlier stated as Proposition 1.3: there is little or no social structure beyond the level of the family. In direct contradiction of this description, Blackston presents a complex and heterogeneous array of community social units. The most numerous and varied of these are the essentially local institutions of modest scale which generally function in relation to various sectional or topical interests and activities. There are well over one hundred churches, temples, and other religious bodies with an astounding variety of doctrines, rituals, ethnic affiliations, sizes of membership, and apparently available resources.

There are political organizations affiliated with all major parties and several minor ones as well. Social clubs are recreational centers, frequently with pronounced ethnic affiliations. Community centers, some religious and others secular, are scattered through the area. Cultural programs covering most of the arts also often have an ethnic focus. There is an active parents association or PTA connected with each public school in the community. Units based in part on shared residence include many block associations and tenants councils. Blackston had a major local welfare rights organization before the national coalition of such groups developed. Other special interest voluntary associations range from athletic clubs to self-defense groups. Several sizeable and more or less rivalrous youth groups combine religious leadership and indoctrination with such martial features as military titles and chains of command, government-surplus uniforms, and close order drills. There appear to be no fighting clubs or delinquent gangs in Blackston at present. According to local tradition, such groups did exist until a few years ago when their disappearance coincided with an increase in narcotics use.

Beyond the level of these types of groups, there are four major organizations which have recently been competing for community-wide constituencies. The first of these is the Blackston Community Council which grew out of previous civic groups in the area and was founded in its present form in 1963. The second is a major instrument of metropolitan and national government on the local scene, a Model Cities Agency. The remaining two are local affiliates of national groups committed to programs of radical opposition to the socio-political status quo. The Black Panther Party takes a coalitionist revolutionary position. The Republic of New Africa is no less revolutionary but takes a more separatist Black Nationalist line.

The Blackston Community Council (BCC) is the only one of these organizations that originated locally, and it has a longer history than the others. With more than 100 affiliated groups within the community, BCC presently functions as the conduit for anti-poverty funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity and other federal agencies. As such it provides financial support for a rather wide variety of the local groups described above. It maintains five local civic action centers in as many neighborhoods of the community. This council also has central services ranging from job placement and educational development to family planning and consumer education in conjunction with a credit union. Among the affiliates which it supports financially are self-consciously Afro-American groups, Hispano-American ethnic organizations, block associations, and various more or less indigenous social service programs.

Unlike many anti-poverty community corporations across the country, BCC is sufficiently decentralized and democratic to be at least somewhat responsive to local citizen pressure. It has an elected executive body, as well as a general assembly in which many important policy issues actually are thrashed out in public meetings open to all citizens. Nevertheless, BCC is also necessarily subject to powerful forces extending from the metropolitan city hall to the government in Washington. Partly because of its rather loose structure, the council is an arena in which ethnic, sectional, occupational, class, and other interests are in constant dynamic interplay. The official stance of the organization as a whole is one of unified militance in service of communal interests, together with explicit recognition of ethnic and organizational divisions within the community. Its official constituency is "the Black and Puerto Rican community." It uses both English and Spanish as official languages, particularly in written materials. Problems incident to translation, duplication, and distribution of such materials are a frequent source of minor friction. There are the beginnings of an organized demand from French-speaking Afro-Americans for increased use of French. Major strains and formal organizational problems are associated with distributing authority, power, and jobs between two broad segments generally referred to as Black and Spanish. A more informal and less explicit but otherwise similar dynamic exists with respect to narrower ethnic groupings (e. g. West Indians) as well as segments outside the two broad categories (e. g. Whites).

Many -- probably a majority -- of the council-affiliated organizations are more or less conspicuously structured along ethnic lines. Relatively few of these groups manifest a formal emphasis on inter-ethnic unity (e. g. military-patriotic marching corps and some church agencies). Others make their ethnic exclusiveness explicit through their names or other conspicuous symbols (e. g. Daughters of African Descent, Moorish Science Temple, Puerto Rican Culture Action Project). In a greater number of instances, dominance by particular ethnic or other parochial elements is achieved through informal networks and more or less covert maneuvering. All this goes on in a context of multiple parallel, overlapping and/or competing organizations both within and beyond the BCC structure.

Official expressions of ethnic distinctiveness are generally in terms of either a North American Afro-cultural identity or a Puerto Rican identity. Policy statements, cultural programs, and the like manifest only the scantest recognition of other Afro-American or Latin allegiances and heritages. This facade masks a much greater diversity of interests and identifications. Not infrequently, less public ethnic affiliations, together with more or less related organizational and ideological initiatives, are expressed in the behavior of leading individuals. One of the top leaders in BCC's central apparatus is a West Indian who is helping to give legitimacy to the demand for French-language programs and activities. The dominant personality of one BCC local action center is a British West Indian with autocratic tendencies and close connections with the police. He tends to be distrusted by North American Blacks who are numerous in the local area and many of whom favor a more democratic organization. The main driving force in another action center is a city-bred northern North American Black militant who suffers Afro-American Southerners graciously enough but has no use for West Indians, Puerto Ricans, or Whites. An exceptional case is an urban Black American woman with some fairly remote West Indian roots, who has been a prime mover in Blackston for many years and a major leader of BCC since its inception. She is one of the few effective militants who maintains active contacts ranging from revolutionary organizations through the moderate reformist clergy to the upper rungs of the official city power structure. She probably comes as close as any leader in this community to receiving equal respect and trust from all ethnic segments.

The community council receives and responds to multiple external pressures which importantly condition its operations. A fundamental limiting condition is the source of money and authority which make it an official anti-poverty agency. Among many other effects, this constrains BCC to play down ethnic conflict and emphasize communal unity. At the same time, however, militant participation in radical community causes (e. g. community control of schools, or any but the most paltry and perfunctory initiative against the police) brings immediate negative sanctions from outside: investigations, rules against helping unofficial movements, threats of firings and of withholding funds.

All this is complicated and exaccerbated by the recent emergence of the Model Cities program. This federal initiative is automatically rival to the community corporation for funds, jobs, patronage, and all the various forms of power that can be conferred by external government. The Model Cities Agency (MCA) thus commands considerable leadership participation from Blackston because of the great resources reportedly at its disposal. Although the local MCA is as yet little more than a planning body, all these dynamics of conflict and competition have been in full play for some time, both publicly and especially in more or less covert forms. Only the top of this iceberg was showing when BCC partisans picketed and sat-in at the MCA headquarters.

Despite the formation of obscurely appointed committees allegedly representing the local populace in decisions by MCA, the agency appears to function more as a massive assertion of city and federal power within the local community. The citizenry so far seems to have no real decision-making role with respect to the agency's actual operations. With this reassertion of metropolitan powers centers backed by the federal government, rivalry between BCC and MCA becomes even more complex and rancorous, reflecting both local factionalism and interagency conflict as far away as Washington. Among the semi-public accusations leveled at MCA locally is that it is a patronage preserve for West Indians. Mutual influences between this agency and initiatives for local self-determination are further complicated by the fact that MCA's sphere of operations extends over two neighboring poverty districts which differ considerably from Blackston in ethnic composition, class structure, and other respects. These are the areas immediately east and northwest of Blackston respectively, as described briefly in an earlier section. Meanwhile, except for vague assurances of huge resources to be poured into the community, the actual plans of the program have been kept largely secret from the public. So-called "public hearings" on the "model cities package" were a farcial fraud in which the most a citizen could learn was the identities of a few individuals and groups that appeared to have thrown in their lot with the MCA.

While the Black Panther Party had maintained nearby offices and programs previously, it did not establish its Blackston headquarters until 1969. Since that time, local operations have followed BPP national policies. A free breakfast program provides a morning meal for upwards of 75 children each day. Free clothing is periodically made available to the community in large quantities. A health clinic, also free, operates one day a week under two medical men. Political discussion groups and classes are carried on regularly. The national newspaper of the party is distributed in the community. The BPP has supported community control of the public schools and more recently has strongly advocated local control of the police. The broader ideological orientation of the BPP is Marxist. The local branch of the party has undergone the same pressures and harrassments from news media and police authorities that have recently become so familiar in other ghettos across the country.

The Republic of New Africa is a recently formed revitalization movement which, although its impact on the community has not yet been very large, may have great potential. The stated goal of RONA is to create an independent, sovereign Afro-American nation with all the distinctive social, political, and cultural institutions which this implies. In keeping with this image the offices of this organization in Blackston and elsewhere are designated consulates. Thus far its principal local activities have been two. Classes have been organized as the nucleus of an educational institution called the Yoruba Academy which is intended to be a major instrument of cultural revitalization. The New Africans have also begun to prepare the community for what they hope will be a plebiscite on Afro-American independence. The ideal projection expressed by the group is that this referendum would be overseen by the United Nations and would lead to a peaceful secession from the United States. Although this campaign has not yet had much success, its expressed goal is that Blackston should become "the first liberated territory of the Republic of New Africa," with other Black communities to follow later. RONA, like the BPP, has been greatly affected by very strong opposition from law enforcement agencies and authorities.

In addition to these organizations, there are numerous other minority advancement groups which have members and carry on occasional activities in Blackston, even though they do not maintain local branches or offices here. These include most of the more militant nationally organized groups with ghetto roots. Even when taken together, these radical forces do not rival the power and resources of BCC or MCA. This does not mean that the challenge of the militant groups is insignificant. The least of this challenge appears when Black Panthers show up at BCC general meetings to denounce the council leadership as Uncle Toms or worse. Another dimension appears in the social services beginning to be offered by these groups in obvious direct competition with the more establishment-oriented organizations. Beyond all this, the effect of the radical ideological and tactical positions taken by these groups may be far beyond anything an outsider depending on the mass media for his information would believe. In this community there is an enormous fund of goodwill toward the Black Panther Party in particular which would never be predicted from the outside. We have seen this go to extremes which led to disillusionment, as when youngsters involved in recent racial crises in high schools requested Panther protection, which never materialized. The Republic of New Africa and other groups are much less known among the general citizenry. Nevertheless, the response of large and quite heterogeneous audiences to oratory by some of their leaders indicates that the revolutionary nationalist message of these organizations strikes some highly responsive chords.

The Community Council presently remains the dominant organization maintaining or seeking a communitywide constituency. This was symbolized by the conduct of ceremonies on the principal local ethnic holiday, African-American Day, 1969. The proceedings and festivities, involving hundreds of people over several hours, were completely controlled by BCC. A considerable spectrum of Black celebrities from outside the community took part, and a wide variety of local groups were represented. Yet neither Model Cities, the Panthers, nor the New Africans were either represented on the program or even mentioned by any speaker on the platform. Yet relationships among these organizations are not limited to conflict or mutual isolation. The Council, the Panthers, RONA, and other local activist groups (though not MCA) have worked in common cause against forces outside the community during crises such as certain phases of the struggle for control of local schools. It is predictable that if extremes of external opposition to locally perceived community interests occur again, a similar unity will emerge once more. Whatever else may be said about this politically and culturally dynamic scene, it must be clear that Blackston will not fit any stereotype of a poor community lacking social organization beyond the family.

The one remaining tenet from the theory of poverty culture is Proposition 1.4, that family life is disorganized, unstable, pathological. A sample of our data on this problem area is summarized in the accompanying tabulation. This sample includes a core of contiguous households from a representative block with additional units from the surrounding neighborhood. This block and its environs are in one of the poorer parts of Blackston. The neighborhood is well over three-quarters Black which makes it more predominantly Afro-American than the community as a whole, though as the tabulation shows there is also considerable ethnic diversity in this particular area.

SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS

	Number	Percent
Total Sample		
Dwelling units	132	100%
Individual persons	633	100%
Location of dwelling units		
Single block	86	65
Surrounding area	46	35
	132	100%
Ethnic identification of dwelling units		
U. S. Afro-American	99	75
Afro-American from outside U. S.	12	10
Puerto Rican	15	11
Euro-American	2	1
Mixed	4	3
	132	100%

	Number	Percent
All Family Households		
Household units	119	100%
Individual members	620	100%
Average number of persons per household	5.2	--
Household structure as defined by dominant adult male and female roles		
Families headed by legally married husband and wife, both present	72	60
Families headed by commonlaw husband and wife, both present	15	13
Families headed by married pair with husband non-resident but functional	7	6
Families headed by adult males who are unmarried, widowed, divorced, or functionally separated	3	3
Families headed by women who are unmarried widowed, divorced, or functionally separated	22	18
	119	100%
Afro-American Family Households		
Household units	103	100%
Individual members	544	100%
Average number of persons per household	5.3	--
Household structure as defined by dominant adult male and female roles		
Families headed by legally married husband and wife, both present	64	62
Families headed by commonlaw husband and wife, both present	13	13
Families headed by married pair with husband non-resident but functional	6	6
Families headed by adult male who is unmarried, widowed, divorced, or functionally separated	2	2
Families headed by a woman who is unmarried, widowed, divorced, or functionally separated	18	17
	103	100%

It has recently been re-emphasized (e. g. Gonzalez 1970) that the term "household" can be reserved for cooperative groups with a residential structure, while using "family" to refer to kinship networks. While we shall return to this and related conceptions presently, we choose here to combine the two terms in the phrase "family household." Our point is that the domestic units we are finding fully possess the characteristics both of residential groupings and of small kin networks. In all 132 dwelling units, the only ones not structured primarily around kin ties are 13 single individuals living alone. Of the remaining 119 households all are organized through consanguineal relationships, and all but 25 (21%) are focused on a conjugal bond between senior adults. It should also be noted that less than ten of these domestic units include individuals who are not relatives of other household members. These and other salient patterns represented in the table are essentially the same for the sample as a whole and for Afro-Americans as a segment. The overall picture is certainly not one of disorganization or disintegration.

The concept of "matrifocality" has recently been usefully redefined as "female role dominance in concrete social structures such as families, households," and so forth (Gonzalez 1970:243). Since matrifocality is one of the principal traits emphasized by describers of poverty culture and similar concepts, we have arranged the above table partly to inquire how matrifocal the community under study appears to be. In nearly two-thirds of our sample, the domestic unit is organized around a legally married pair both of whom reside in the home. Responsibility for economic support and management, authority and decision making, and disciplining of children are typically shared by husband and wife in these households, with relative dominance generally being exercised by the males. Households classified as headed by a common-law pair are limited to those in which the conjugal bond has endured for a long period -- brief and casual relationships being ruled out. In these domestic groups there is a sharing of responsibilities, with a tendency toward male dominance, similar to the first category. The same is true of the smaller number of cases in which the adult male does not reside in the household but does continue to function in most other aspects of the father-husband role. Some men reside separately because of personal incompatibility but still regularly contribute income, visit the household, participate in socializing the children, and influence domestic decisions. Others are absent only part of the time and return periodically, often for occupational reasons: e. g. truck drivers, seamen, military servicemen. There is a small number of men who head sizeable consanguineal families without anyone who really functions in the wife-mother status.

It should perhaps also be added that four of the male-headed households are mixed conjugal-consanguineal extended families: though there is a senior married pair there are also one or two unmarried daughters with children in the home. Taken altogether, these several categories of households -- constituting as they do over 80% of the total sample -- are predominantly patrifocal rather than matrifocal.

The remaining minority -- only 17% of the Afro-American sub-sample -- are organized around women who do not have a particular male reliably fulfilling the husband-father role. These are female-headed consanguineal familites of the type frequently cited as the hallmark of matrifocality. There is no denying that typically in these cases the mother is the central and sometimes dominant figure of the household. Yet these families are by no means bereft of adult male contact, companionship, or support. About half of them have close male kinsmen living nearby to whom they can often turn for assistance. Several of them provide informal social centers frequently attended by neighborhood men. Varied and fluctuating economic contributions are forthcoming from suitors and consorts. Young boys of these families may find many male role models through observation and interpersonal relations both within and outside their households. Theirs is not by any means a world totally ruled and smothered by females. Men in various relationships to these families may be strong authority figures. Moreover, not all such households remain permanently female-headed. All in all, this seems to be, at the most, a pattern of moderate rather than extreme matrifocality. Remembering again that it represents only a small part of our sample, the evidence thus far appears to indicate that the Afro-Americans of Blackston, and the community as a whole, are more patrifocal than matrifocal in their domestic life. (It is worth noting in this connection that Harris (1969), working with videotape studies of domestic behavior, has recently been finding strong male authority figures in structurally "matrifocal" urban Afro-American households.)

There is a significant degree of fluctuation in the composition of these households over time. During the past two years, there have been shifts of membership in perhaps one-third of the units in our sample. Probably at least half these shifts involve changes in residence by children and mobile collateral relatives, some of them quite regular like summer-long visits to and from the South by youngsters. Yet fluctuations making more basic changes are not uncommon. Single women with children do marry, and conjugal households do break up for a wide variety of reasons. Fluctuating economic circumstances, the restless search for ways around the barrier of discrimination, occasional difficulties with legal authorities, ambivalence among many Afro-Americans about the North and the South, or about urban and rural scenes, may all be involved. These and many other factors contribute to changing domestic arrangements and relations which, by and large, are adaptive rather than disorganized.

This brings us back to the point made by Gonzalez (1970) that families and households may not be simple, concrete units, and the elaboration by Whitten and Szwed (1907b) that domestic and other behavior of peoples in marginal circumstances can best be understood in terms of individual-centered networks rather than bounded groups. The domestic and inter-familial dynamism of Blackston just referred to does indeed depend upon a flexible and complex relationship between kinship and residence, and it certainly involves the development of personal networks including neighbors, friends, work associates, and others as well as kinsmen. So we keep these conceptions, recently elaborated in the literature, before us as we continue our research. Thus far, however, the evidence in Blackston does not entirely bear out these formulations.

Gonzalez argues that matrifocality exists in circumstances such as the subordination and insecurity of Afro-Americans because, by "keeping the home fires burning" when males are prevented from functioning successfully, it offers a selective advantage which enhances survival chances. Blackston certainly typifies the conditions cited, but we find little matrifocality here. Whitten and Szwed suggest that under similar conditions bounded groups are maladaptive with little survival value, and we should therefore expect them to be replaced by networks and "quasi-groups" of a non-bounded character. Yet in Blackston we find that oppressed people cling tenaciously to their bounded groups, both domestic and non-domestic, and struggle to maintain them. To the present point in our work, it appears that networks function primarily to link and facilitate relations between groups, not as an alternative or substitute for bounded social entities.

Persuasive arguments can be made in the abstract for the adaptive value both of matrifocality and of reliance on unbounded networks in preference to groups. Moreover, empirical evidence from the Black Carib, Afro-Americans of Ecuador, and elsewhere appears to support these arguments. Why then do we not find that Blackstonians have followed these paths? We are prepared for the possibility that further research will show that our community is more like the others than we at first recognized. Meanwhile, we have some alternative interpretations based on our evidence to date.

We conclude tentatively that the Afro-American family in the urban United States is much more oriented toward mainstream patrifocal patterns and values than the sociological literature has recognized. This failure to recognize social reality probably has two main sources. The basic difficulty is the pervasive double bias of most American social scientists, who are both White and middle-class. The operational expression of this bias is the interview and questionnaire methodology usually employed to portray Afro-American communities. We have much concrete evidence that Afro-Americans see no reason why they should reveal to alien or unknown interviewers the intimacies of their domestic life, family finances, and kindred matters. This, plus related considerations, gives us every reason to believe that official censuses of communities like Blackston are full of misinformation (see later section on methodological experiments). Moreover, many of the concepts and categories around which such surveys are organized seem wide of the mark indeed. Even if interviewers could obtain valid information here, our community would probably be rated something like 40% matrifocal simply because no more than six out of ten sets of parents are both legally married and residing in the same house. Our experience leads us to believe that the scholarly and official definitions of marital and familial roles should be changed to take account at least of commonlaw spouses and non-resident but otherwise functional husbands.

There are no doubt many differences between the urban north of the United States and the Caribbean or South America which may help to account for contrasts in behavior between those areas and Blackston. One broad, general, and surely important contrast must be that Afro-American urbanites in the U. S. have been more thoroughly enculturated and socialized in mainstream Anglo-American culture than have Black Caribs or Ecuadoreans in the Hispano-American equivalent mainstream. One senses that this must be the case, though the question how and why it should be so is an ethnohistorical problem quite beyond the reach of our present research. Knowing full well that this special exposure in the U. S. is no matter of simple acculturation, much less assimilation, we shall explore further the phenomenon of biculturation in the next section. Dwelling for the moment on this one side of biculturation, however, we cannot help draw attention to a seeming paradox. Of all culturally distinctive ethnic groups in the United States none has been more excoriated for its alleged failure to approximate mainstream norms than Afro-Americans. Yet current evidence indicates that, compared with Blacks elsewhere in the hemisphere at least, Afro-Americans in the U. S. have devoted themselves to Euro-American standards and ideals well beyond -- perhaps even in contradiction of -- adaptation for survival. No doubt this phenomenon constitutes an item on the agenda of those who hope to revitalize the ethnic collectivity in relation to its own heritage of Afro-Americana. Certainly these considerations, as well as the data which inspire them, are incapable of being ordered through any such conception as the "culture of poverty."

There is another interpretive tradition which focuses on Afro-American domestic relations and is closely related to the poverty culture school of thought. Its last generalized presentation was produced by Bernard (1966), and its most recent elaboration in relation to specific research data is in Hannerz' work (1969b:34ff). These interpretations generally present internal differences within Afro-American communities as distinct "life styles," but the core of the differences appears to lie in sex roles, household composition, and family life. The basic distinction here is between "respectables" and "undesirables." Hannerz refers to this dichotomy as "a ghetto view," thus implying that the classification is part of the "ghetto-specific" culture his book is designed to portray. Yet his discussion hardly allows one to doubt that he knows these terms and their implications come directly from mainstream culture. Here as elsewhere Hannerz seems to underestimate the bicultural implications of his own data.

Instead he elaborates the dichotomy into a fourfold scheme of life styles presented as "ideal types": mainstreamers, swingers, street families, and streetcorner men. Hannerz deserves credit for calling attention to cultural variation within the ghetto, but our findings make us feel that he has misconstrued the nature and dimensions of this diversity. Anyone who knows a community like Blackston would certainly recognize many of the behaviors described by Hannerz under his four rubrics. Our data, however, simply do not show individuals or families sorting themselves out into such categories. From our viewpoint these "types" seem more like stereotypes than empirically supportable groupings. It is not just that individuals and families frequently engage in different typebehaviors through time, which Hannerz acknowledges. More important, only a small minority of the people we know well in Blackston could be clearly and convincingly typed in any one of these categories at any time. Most persons, households, networks, and voluntary associations overlap this classification and defy its boundaries. A majority of men in our community not only profess many "mainstream" ideals but really strive to actualize these values, while at the same time they take what opportunities they can find for engaging in "swinger" pleasures, and few are total strangers to the "street life" invoked by Hannerz' other two categories. Likewise there are few women who do not believe in "mainstream" desiderata sufficiently to accept them when and if they are available, who do not "swing" when they have a chance to, or who know nothing of "street" patterns. There are particular individuals who conform conspicuously -- even dramatically -- to each type, but they are an exceptional minority.

Another interpretation which might appeal to theorists of such "life styles" also cannot be squared with our data. This is the possibility that such categories as those put forward by Hannerz et al. might correspond in good measure with variations in domestic behavior and related matters which we have found to be real in Blackston. One might suspect, for example, that female-headed households supported by welfare would generally resemble "street families," that younger adults with relatively good incomes might often be "swingers," that patrifocal households supported by working people would tend to correspond with "mainliners," and so forth. What we actually find, however, bears little resemblance to such correspondences. Some welfare-supported matrifocal households are among the most mainstream-oriented families in other respects such as church attendance, school participation, taste in clothing, cleanliness, neatness, or politeness of speech. Many employed heads of patrifocal household have well developed mainstream preoccupations in areas as diverse as saving or investing money, making plans for moving out of the ghetto, and teaching middle-class manners and values to their children -- while the very same men often have commonlaw spouses, go on periodic "swinging" expeditions (some with their mates, others not), participate in various forms of petty crime, and spend many hours acting just like "street corner men" either on their own block or elsewhere.

Further, examples could be adduced at great length. The point, however, should be clear. The categories in question simply do not portray social reality in Blackston. The basic reason for this also seems clear to us. The categories themselves are not derived from experience of Afro-American community life. They come from an old fashioned, bourgeoiscentric, White-oriented, moralistic and pejorative system of biases and myths which the real "mainstreamers" use to congratulate themselves and justify despising others. Students of the ghetto may well find these or similar stereotypes expressed and discussed by the people they study. Such conceptions are certainly a conspicuous part of Afro-American consciousness in Blackston. Yet this merely indicates how deeply bicultural the Black poor are, even to the point of at least halfway believing Euro-American stereotypes against themselves.

Moreover, it would be quite easy to construct additional "life styles" from our data. We could adduce carefully selected evidence to support such notions as a drug-addicted style, a criminal-delinquent subculture, a political-activist-militant style, a ghetto-specific subculture of youth, a self-isolated segment or stratum dedicated only to escape from the ghetto by upward mobility, an inward-turning collectivity focused entirely on discovering and/or creating the Black African heritage, one or more piously religious life styles, and many more. Each of these types would point to some real phenomena in the community, but each would be no less spurious and stereotypical than the categories examined earlier. The difficulty is not merely that the categories overlap greatly or that individuals and groups very frequently change their behavior in ways that would affect their assignment to such categories. At least two considerations seem more basic than these. One is that ethnic diversity within the Afro-American universe seems clearer and more real than these artificial subcultural categories. The other is that all segments of the Black community seem to have common cultural characteristics which are more important in forming their lives than internal differences of the kind emphasized by Hannerz and others.

5. Black Cultural Diversity and Unity

As with other aspects of culture, our approach to the ethnic complexities of Blackston begins with respectful attention to local socially shared categories and understandings. The broad outlines of ethnic groupings as they exist and function in the community social structure are defined by the vocabulary and idiom of Afro-American English as spoken here. This terminology of ethnic classification belongs to the English of Afro-Americans who are natives of the United States. It is also generally understood by Afro-Americans from other areas, and it is widely used -- at least in inter-ethnic communication -- by additional groups whose native tongue is not English.

"Blacks," "Negroes," and "colored people" are broadly synonymous designations most often applied to Afro-Americans with origins in the U. S., though in some contexts the same terms may refer to groups with African heritage from other countries.(Preferences for one or another of the three phrasings are correlated with age, political persuasion broadly defined with respect to ethnic relations, the ethnic structure of the situation within which communication occurs, and other contextual or relational factors.) A second major category is "West Indians," generally referring to English-speaking Afro-Americans from the various British islands in the Caribbean. The term "Haitians" certainly includes people from the nation indicated and may well comprehend French-speaking Afro-Americans from such other areas as Guadaloupe, Martinique, and French Guiana. In some linguistic and social contexts, these two major Caribbean categories are included in the broader usage of "Black" (and its synonyms).

Racially ambiguous designations include "Cubans" and "Panamanians." One sometimes hears "Black Cuban" (or "colored Cuban") and "Black Panamanian" ("colored Panamanian"), which define an Afro-American identity within these two nationalities. People who come from Hispano-American sovereignties and are not identified with Afro-Americans are most generally labeled "Spanish." The major category within this classification is "Puerto Rican"; indeed the latter term is not infrequently treated as synonymous with "Spanish." The designation for Americans of European derivation is "Whites" or "white people." The two groups most commonly distinguished terminologically within this category are "Jews" and "Italians." Other European extractions with very small local representation, such as Scandinavians and Irish, commonly receive only the broader categorization "White" (and synonyms). Additional local categories correspond closely with usages of mainstream American English: "Arabs," "Chinese," "Gypsies."

In short, the classificatory system most widely shared in the community consists of three major categories -- Black or Afro-American, Spanish or Hispano-American, and White or Euro-American -- plus certain subdivisions, and several residual categories which happen to be mainly Asian in derivation. Beyond this there are some numbers of narrower subdivisions: the recognition of these is less generally shared and sometimes confined to self-identification by a particular subgroup. Putting together the broader system with the subgroups, we find at the present stage in our research that approximately two dozen distinct ethnic collectivities are represented in Blackston. The following paragraphs tentatively summarize historical, demographic, and socioeconomic features of each of these groups, as we know them thus far.

The U. S. Afro-Americans of Blackston commonly divide themselves into "Southerners" or "people from down south" and "Northerners" or "people from up here." There is a tendency to identify Southerners with "country people" as opposed to northern "city people." (In fact, some Blacks who identify the South as home came from cities, but the majority hail from rural or small town communities.) The Black Southerners are undoubtedly the largest ethnic grouping in the community, probably amounting to more than 35% of the whole local population and a solid majority of Afro-Americans. A few of them have been here for two generations or more, though for most it has been less than one generation. Migration from the South continues today, though perhaps at a slower pace than in previous years. The areas from which the majority have come are the small towns and rural counties of seaboard states from Virginia to Florida. Smaller numbers are from the Mississippi valley or from border states. Southerners recognize within their ranks some minor regional and dialectical subdivisions, such as the Geechees from eastern South Carolina. The Southerners as a group are the poorest citizens of Blackston with the highest rates of unemployment, underemployment, and low-skill jobs.

Black Northerners are a much smaller group, constituting perhaps 10% to 15% of Blackston's polyglot populace. Most of these people were born or brought up in the metropolitan area which includes Blackston. A few families have been long established in the community, but most have come from nearby urban districts in the past 10 to 20 years. Their proportion of the local population appears to be approximately static, with only small numbers moving either into or out of the community. This grouping shows slightly more varied socioeconomic characteristics than the Southerners. At least a few more Northerners work at skilled trades, lower-level civil service occupations such as postman, or in semi-professional work like nursing. Home ownership and small business proprietorship -- rare among local Black Southerners -- are not quite so uncommon among Northerners.

Nearly all the remaining English-speaking Afro-Americans have their origins in British territories of the West Indies and in parts of northern South America. Taken together they amount to perhaps 5-8% of Blackston's citizenry. They generally classify themselves by area of origin or ancestry. The most prominent local groupings are Barbadans (Bajuns), Jamaicans, Trinidadians, Guyanese, and Takitaki-speakers from Surinam. These distinctions are not well understood among most Blackstonians born or reared in the United States, but members of each of the named groups (and perhaps others) consider themselves ethnically distinct. The only other Black English speakers of whom we are aware in the community are know to us only by local report, not by observation. It is said that a few West Africans have recently moved into Blackston. They may be students, and we do not know yet whether they are (or will be) a significant part of the community.

Most if not all of the Afro-English Caribbeans now present in the community have come to Blackston since World War II. Their immigration is continuing in small numbers, though there also seems to be a tendency for West Indians to move away to more desireable residential areas as their fortunes improve. There are indications that Black Caribbeans of various extractions were among the first elements to replace Jews during early post-war years in many blocks of Blackston, and it appears that the peak of this movement is past. Of all Afro-Americans here, these groups are rather conspicuously the least disadvantaged in socioeconomic terms. Proportionally speaking, Black Caribbeans hold the largest share of skilled, technical, and managerial positions. This is especially noticeable in certain large institutions, such as hospitals where, for example, sizeable majorities of the nurses and technicians may be West Indians. Families of these groups are also more likely to own their homes than other Afro-Americans. These homes tend to be somewhat concentrated in the least deteriorated blocks of two-family houses, which makes the Afro-English Caribbeans one of the few non-European categories that is partially segregated residentially within the community.

Other Afro-American groups are as yet less well known to us, partly because they seem to be quite few in numbers locally and partly because several of them are not represented at all in the sections of Blackston thus far best known to us. All remaining groups that we know of are classifiable as either Afro-French (perhaps 4-5% of the community) or Afro-Spanish speakers (perhaps 3-4%). Haitians who speak a French Creole are a small but apparently growing element in the local population. We are told that other Afro-French Caribbeans exist here as well, but we have not observed them ourselves. A special case is that of the few local people who identify themselves as Louisiana Creoles. From those whom we know thus far it appears that these people do have an Afro-French linguistic heritage. Present indications are that this tradition is hardly manifested actively in community life, however, for its carriers are not sufficiently numerous to maintain extensive networks or associations which might serve as media for cultural expression. Even though some ties are maintained with the New Orleans area, locally this Afro-French element appears to be largely assimilated to the status of Black Northerners. The bulk of the Afro-Spanish people appear to be Cubans and Panamanians. An observably distinct grouping is made of people from the "A. B. C. Islands" (Aruba, Bonaire, and Curacao) who speak the Spanish-based pidgin or creole language Papiamento. Tentative indications suggest that Papiamento-speakers were among the earlier Afro-Americans to establish themselves here in socioeconomic statuses somewhat higher than most U. S. born Blacks. Preliminary information also shows that many of these people hold skilled jobs at present.

The population elements that are unconnected with Afro-Americans interest us mainly as parts of the community social structure and categories for comparison with Afro-Americans. By far the most prominent of these are Spanish speakers of Latin American origins. Certainly the majority of these hail from Puerto Rico, though an undetermined smaller portion came from other parts of Latin America. Compared with other local groupings, the Hispano-Americans as a whole show considerable variation in such socioeconomic indices as income,

2/

by a particular subgroup. Putting together the broader system with the subgroups, we find at the present stage in our research that approximately two dozen distinct ethnic collectivities are represented in Blackston. The following paragraphs tentatively summarize historical, demographic, and socioeconomic features of each of these groups, as we know them thus far.

The U. S. Afro-Americans of Blackston commonly divide themselves into "Southerners" or "people from down south" and "Northerners" or "people from up here." There is a tendency to identify Southerners with "country people" as opposed to northern "city people." (In fact, some Blacks who identify the South as home came from cities, but the majority hail from rural or small town communities.) The Black Southerners are undoubtedly the largest ethnic grouping in the community, probably amounting to more than 35% of the whole local population and a solid majority of Afro-Americans. A few of them have been here for two generations or more, though for most it has been less than one generation. Migration from the South continues today, though perhaps at a slower pace than in previous years. The areas from which the majority have come are the small towns and rural counties of seaboard states from Virginia to Florida. Smaller numbers are from the Mississippi valley or from border states. Southerners recognize within their ranks some minor regional and dialectical subdivisions, such as the Geechees from eastern South Carolina. The Southerners as a group are the poorest citizens of Blackston with the highest rates of unemployment, underemployment, and low-skill jobs.

Black Northerners are a much smaller group, constituting perhaps 10% to 15% of Blackston's polyglot populace. Most of these people were born or brought up in the metropolitan area which includes Blackston. A few families have been long established in the community, but most have come from nearby urban districts in the past 10 to 20 years. Their proportion of the local population appears to be approximately static, with only small numbers moving either into or out of the community. This grouping shows slightly more varied socioeconomic characteristics than the Southerners. At least a few more Northerners work at skilled trades, lower-level civil service occupations such as postman, or in semi-professional work like nursing. Home ownership and small business proprietorship -- rare among local Black Southerners -- are not quite so uncommon among Northerners.

Nearly all the remaining English-speaking Afro-Americans have their origins in British territories of the West Indies and in parts of northern South America. Taken together they amount to perhaps 5-8% of Blackston's citizenry. They generally classify themselves by area of origin or ancestry. The most prominent local groupings are Barbadans (Bajuns), Jamaicans, Trinidadians, Guyanese, and Takitaki-speakers from Surinam. These distinctions are not well understood among most Blackstonians born or reared in the United States, but members of each of the named groups (and perhaps others) consider themselves ethnically distinct. The only other Black English speakers of whom we are aware in the community are know to us only by local report, not by observation. It is said that a few West Africans have recently moved into Blackston. They may be students, and we do not know yet whether they are (or will be) a significant part of the community.

occupation, and education. In particular it is noticeable that this group includes more small proprietors and more office workers than others. In a few areas there is some tendency for Puerto Ricans to be nucelated residentially. This appears to be a result of absentee landlords following discriminatory rental policies. More generally in the community as a whole, Blacks and Puerto Ricans are dispersed and scattered through the same residential blocks.

Most of the Jews, Italians, and other Euro-Americans still living in Blackston are elderly people who have remained while their younger compatriots have moved elsewhere. The exceptions to this pattern are the Jewish and Italian enclaves mentioned earlier at opposite peripheries of the community. These give every appearance of being middle-class neighborhoods. In addition to retired people, many skilled workers and some professionals live in these few blocks. Though they are not toally uni-racial, these are also the most obviously segregated neighborhoods in the community. The Jewish enclave may well be quite permanent, for its consists of several high-rise cooperative apartments which are in good condition. The Italian population, on the other hand, appears to be declining by attrition, with Afro-Americans and Hispano-Americans gradually replacing the earlier inhabitants.

The remaining groups are very small but quite noticeable on the local scene both because of their distinctive appearance and because of their specialized roles in the economy and social structure of the community. With few if any exceptions, the Arabs all appear to be either small shopkeepers or workers in Arab-owned newspaper stands, cigar and candy stores, groceries, and the like. There is at least some small continuing immigration from various parts of the Arabian Peninsula; we are not aware of local people from other parts of the Arab world. The handfull of Chinese living in Blackston all seem to be either proprietors or workers in local restaurants and laundries. A thin scattering of Gypsies in one part of Blackston operate fortune telling and spiritualist establishments. According to local knowledge, all three of these groups have long been established here in small numbers.

Some of the enormously rich and dynamic complexity of this community thus begins to emerge. One cannot even begin to comprehend this variegated human scene without taking into account two interrelated dimensions. The first of these is ethnic-cultural diversity and unity. The second is group stratification of a kind which entails much more than social class as it is usually conceived. Each dimension is complex in itself; each is interrelated in multiple ways with the other, each conditions the other in constant interplay. To deal with one dimension without attention to the other would be a serious over-simplification. The weaknesses of one such simplification -- reduction of the complex actualities to generalities about class-associated "life styles," as in the poverty-culture school of thought and related stratificational approaches -- have been dealt with in the earlier section on poverty and culture. This leads us to seek other theoretical orientations which may give recognition to ethnic-cultural variation.

This whole area of ethnic diversity within the ranks of Afro-Americans in the United States is one on which the traditional social science literature has little to say. Anthropologists working in the Caribbean and Latin America have of course produced many studies of ethnohistorical and cultural variety among peoples of African derivation. The ethnic brethren and cousins of these same groups in the U. S. have traditionally been the preserve of sociologists or of social anthropologists with little interest in culture as the cultural anthropologist understands it. The possibility that this situation might have been rectified through the influence of the Afro-Americanist Melville Herskovits was prematurely cut off when E. Franklin Frazier was declared by orthodox social scientists to be the winner of the famous controversy about Africanisms. In any case, neither Herskovits nor his students did much more than outline the problem of cultural derivation as far as Afro-Americans within the U. S. are concerned, their substantive work being almost entirely outside this country (cf. Whitten and Szwed 1970b).

So even the most informative and insightful Black community studies (e. g. Drake and Cayton 1945) paid essentially no attention to ethnicity, ethnohistory, or related matters. From such works one would hardly guess that urban Afro-Americans had come from varied regional, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. The "great migration" to Chicago and elsewhere was pictured as a culturally inchoate and undifferentiated black tide. Internal heterogeneity within the "Black Metropolis" was conceived entirely in terms of social class. Here again the predominant influence of scholars largely preoccupied with the class system, like Lloyd Warner, is obvious. A major effect of this tyrrany of class concepts has been to focus attention almost exclusively on the Euro-American side of Black cultural experience. Both class and caste phenomena surely do exist in Afro-American communities. To conceive of these strata only in terms of models derived from White society, however, and then to assume that such models represent the whole of cultural variation within the Black population, can only produce reductionist distortions of Afro-American reality.

At the same time, however, our research experience is equally conducive to skepticism toward many formulations which appear to emphasize Black ethnic distinctiveness. The first point in this connection which emerges with force from our data is that no concept of a single, uniform "Negro culture" or "ghetto culture" can by itself do justice to an Afro-American collectivity like that of Blackston. There is no need here to repeat our strictures against framers of such conceptions like Berger and Keil, since their work received appropriate consideration in our discussion of poverty and culture. What is more relevant here, however, is further attention to the ideas of Ulf Hannerz (1969, 1970). His concept of "ghetto specific culture" is the best developed, most fully formulated statement of Afro-American cultural distinctiveness that has emerged thus far from studies of Black people in the United States. This formulation is used by Hannerz as a framework for ordering and analyzing ethnographic data from a small segment of an urban Afro-American community.

This conceptual framework is not fully or explicitly articulated until the final chapter of Hannerz' book, titled Soulside (1969). At that point it becomes clear that the theory is derived deductively from selected notions in the social science literature. Fundamental among these is the idea that "culture is largely situational" (Hannerz 1969b:183). Our disagreement with this basic proposition has received attention elsewhere (Valentine 1968a, Valentine et al. 1969, Hannerz op. cit.). In our view, this formulation robs the culture concept of essential meanings that give the concept its explanatory and interpretive power. For present purposes we need only add that if culture is defined as largely situational, then the concept has no utility in the quest for solutions to the problems our research is designed to illuminate. In other words, defining culture as situational begs the basic question whether the sources of inequality are internal or external to the disadvantaged group. This may be a useful conception for other purposes, but from the viewpoint of our work it merely obscures fundamental issues.

With perfect logical consistency, Hannerz moves directly from the point about situational factors to the conclusion that he must "part company with some of the critics of the concept of a culture of poverty" and instead "return to the original point of view of Oscar Lewis" (Ibid.). With this made clear it is not surprising that, although he adds some potentially important qualifications, Hannerz comes close to identifying "ghetto culture" with the "culture of poverty." Another of Hannerz' biases than becomes more intelligible as consistent with the foregoing. Hannerz announces forthrightly near the beginning of his book that the central question of his research is: "What is different about ghetto living?" He spells it out that "all ghetto dwellers will not get equal time here. There are many who are in the ghetto but not of the ghetto in the sense of exhibiting much of a life style peculiar to the community . . . to their largely mainstream way of life we will devote rather little attention" (Hannerz 1969b:15-16).

In short, Hannerz is telling us that he did not go into the ghetto find what is actually there in the way of social forms and culture patterns, he went only to find "differences." Moreover, when he found phenomena that are obviously best understood as "similarities," he simply ruled them out of serious consideration. It is much to Hannerz' credit that he expresses these biases with sufficient candor so that a critical reader may perceive them directly and need not engage in guessing games with the author. We strongly suspect that most would-be discoverers of special cultures among Blacks or the poor have operated from similar preconceptions without expressing them openly. On the other hand, no amount of candor alone can undo the fact that such biases must have a distorting effect on research findings.

In this case, the distortions are all too clearly in the direction of theoretical positions familiar from elsewhere, including Hannerz' stated debt to Oscar Lewis. Given the preoccupations and prejudgements with which he began, Hannerz' findings that a unitary "ghetto-specific culture" exists and that "mainstreamers" are irrelevant to the cultural essence of Afro-Americana clearly take on the quality of self-fulfilling prophecies. Moreover, the content of the distinctive culture patterns described by Hannerz is depressingly familiar, as may be seen from his summary of "ghetto-specific" traits (1969b:177). It is largely the same old melancholy inventory long purveyed by proponents of class-culture theories: domestic dominance by females; a male role focused on toughness, sex, and alcohol; the battle of the sexes; fear of trouble from the environment and from people; interest in musical, religious, and other expressions of "soul;" and hostility toward the White Establishment.

Behavior corresponding with these descriptions can be observed, certainly in Blackston and no doubt in other Afro-American communities. Yet to list these traits and put them forward as constituting a Black culture, mutually exclusive with mainstream culture, simply ignores many of the most complex, subtle, and interesting aspects of Afro-American life. This formulation allows no exploration of the relative importance or salience of the listed traits and other patterns in ghetto life. By definition it rules out any inquiry into mainstream complexes as possibly central to ghetto experience. It certainly cannot begin to make sense of the many cultural unities and diversities inherent in the multiple Afro-American ethnic identities outlined above for Blackston. Like so many others before it, moreover, this portrayal of the Black ghetto has the form of a comparative statement but actually contains no comparative content, even where it might be warranted. The author seems never to have asked himself, for example, how much of what he describes as "ghetto-specific" might be found in middle-class White communities. Is there no female dominance in suburban Euro-American homes? Are alcohol, sex, or fear of trouble really unknown to affluent White men in America? Is there no domestic strife between males and females outside the ghetto? These unanswered questions and the other foregoing unexamined issues cause the "ghetto-specific culture" to fall apart before ones eyes.

Any thoughtful reader of Hannerz will surely agree that he is a serious, careful, and modest scholar. The difficulty in his work is less one of assertion or commission than it is a problem of selective ommission, failure to probe the complexities and subtleties of Afro-American experience, and willingness to be satisfied by the existing superficialities of the social science literature. When we compare what is said in Soulside with our experience in Blackston, our dominant feeling is that Hannerz' experience of another ghetto must have been constrained, diluted, and ultimately blocked by the conceptions which he brought with him. Obviously this statement has face validity only in relation to results from our own work, and we make it in this form to render more pointed the contrast in our findings. The formulation of "ghetto culture" simply does not make sense of the evidence which flows from the experience of living in Blackston.

Another conception of "Negro culture" in the United States has recently been developed by psychologists (Baratz and Baratz) and linguists (chiefly Stewart). The constructions put forward by these writers are grounded in a critique of traditional conceptions of Afro-American group behavior which our experience tells us is aposite and well taken. They inveigh persuasively against what they call the "deficit model" of Negro behavior, with particular reference to common psychological assumptions about Black pathology and popular notions of Afro-American speech as a structureless, unexpressive, "incorrect" version of what arrogant cultural elites are pleased to call Standard English. We have already indicated in earlier pages that the observable institutionalized impositions of mainstream culture are a quite sufficient explanation for any distinctively Afro-American psychopathology to be found in Blackston. Experience of the same community likewise convinces us that to attach labels like "nonverbal," "linguistically incapable," and so forth to a people as adept at, interested in, and expressive through language as Afro-Americans is simply absurd. In these respects the recent critiques of deficit theories are emphatically supported by our findings.

Working from this basis, the Baratzes, Stewart, and others have propounded an alternative to the deficit model which they call the "difference model." Their initial premise that Afro-Americans are culturally different from other Americans is a proposition that has lately been gaining attention and acceptance among an increasing number of anthropologists and other specialists. The strongest documentation for this position is in the linguistic demonstration that Afro-Americans have developed structurally differentiated dialectical variants of English and other European languages (Stewart 1962 et seq.; Dillard 1964, 1970; Kochman 1969, 1970). Suggestive supporting evidence has also been adduced in folklore and related patterns of oral performance (e.g. Abrahams 1964, 1969, 1970), as well as in music (e. g. Keil 1966, Lomax 1968, 1970). There is nothing in our data from Blackston to contradict these persuasive demonstrations of ethnic distinctiveness in areas of expressive culture. Indeed we expect to gather much evidence that will confirm and perhaps extend these formulations as the present research develops.

Beyond this, however, the Baratzes and Stewart have overextended their model into a simplistic portrayal of cultural separation which, our experience persuades us, is an extreme form of earlier unsupported theses about "Negro culture." These writers repeatedly invoke the name of Herskovits as if he had founded their school of thought, while citing that authority's book, The Myth of the Negro Past, as if it were their inspiration. There is room for doubt about these implications, just as there is ample basis for debate as to the significance and value of Herskovits' work itself (cf. Whitten and Szwed 1970b). At the very least, any formulation which purports to portray a single, homogeneous entity labeled "the Negro subculture" must be a gross oversimplification. Unfortunately, the problem becomes more serious. A few years ago one of the difference-theorists wrote of "a different culture . . . recurrent throughout the country in lower-class Negroes . . . a special cultural configuration . . . in many ways culturally quite different from general middle-class American society" (Stewart 1967a:59. Here again we find the convergence with class-culture notions which has become so familiar in the literature. This same source also betrays the acculturationist or assimilationist bias of this school of thought, representing Negroes as "assimilated in part to the white culture but not entirely" (Ibid.)

The central theoretical weakness of the "difference model" is an implicit assumption that different cultures or subcultures are necessarily competitive alternatives, that distinct cultural systems can enter human experience only as mutually exclusive alternatives, never as intertwined or simultaneously available repertoires (cf. Valentine 1969b). Through the influence of this assumption, the attempt to demonstrate a highly distinctive, minimally variable Negro culture leads to positions which are highly questionable in the light of our evidence. From these premises the argument is made that the misfortunes of Afro-Americans in the contemporary United States are due to "culture conflict" leading to an inability of people brought up in "Negro culture" to understand or practice mainstream behavior. In order to defend these propositions, Stewart first denies that Afro-Americans possess any significant competence in mainstream culture, and then denounces our interest in ethnic subgroup variation as "the tired ploy of attempting to diversify American Negro culture out of existence" (Stewart 1969b:4).

In the same discussion we also find Stewart declaring that "the racists were right in the essence of their facts, even if wrong in the theoretical implications they derived from these facts." By "facts" he explains that he means "much-stigmatized distinctively Negro behaviors" (Op. cit.:1). So again we end up with an imposition of Euro-American cultural categories which surely obscures Afro-American realities, even as it rationalizes away the very problem of inequality itself. Consistently, we find Stewart, Baratz, et al. arguing repeatedly that if school teachers learn about "Negro non-standard dialect" and use it in their classrooms, Afro-American children will achieve success in education, (with the implication that general "acculturation" or "assimilation" will somehow follow naturally (Baratz and Shuy 1969, Stewart 1964; etc.). It has been well stated elsewhere that such arguments merely "support linguistic gimmikry and nostrums" where what is needed is massive institutional and societal change (Fishman 1969:1109). Even worse, this whole line of thought covers up and blocks recognition or understanding of the full range of Afro-American achievement and creativity as well as the real nature of Euro-American institutions in their destructive impact on Black communities.

It is most important to distinguish between the technical validity of analyses like these of Stewart et al. and the broader theoretical significance which is attached to their technical findings. Hundreds of observations of interactions between Blackston people and Euro-American outsiders, including many school teachers, have convinced us that indeed failures in communication often occur for the linguistic reasons that have been put forward. The significance of these purely linguistic failures with respect to educational underachievement, however, is miniscule compared with the nature of the schools and other institutions dominated by Euro-American professionals as instruments for the preservation of inequality.

Compare the obscurantist misconstructions of the "cultural misunderstanding" orientation with the analysis of another sophisticated student of Black-White communication in schools, a linguist not associated with the excesses of difference-model theorists. Thomas Kochman cites and agrees with the linguistic interferences in communication put forward by Stewart and others. However, Kochman adds the following highly important proviso. Kochman describes what he calls "socio-cultural interference" in communication. "Essentially, here the teacher 'turns off' and 'tunes out' the child the minute he begins to express himself in his native dialect or demonstrate other culturally sanctioned behavior. What interferes here are the teacher's own arrogant attitudes toward cultural differences. All kinds of deficiencies are imputed to the native dialect and its speakers to justify her attitude and intervention. Mutual rejection ensues, nourished and intensified by other cultural and aesthetic differences already mentioned." This author concludes that this failure in intergroup relations "is clearly the most prevalent and important factor interfering with communication" (Kochman 1969: 104-105, emphasis added). To maintain that educational techniques fortified with linguistic gimmikry can even touch this problem seems an incredible position.

One implication carried by this position is that generations of educational failure in Afro-American communities are due primarily to a lack of bidialectical teaching methods. A moment's reflection on the millions of European and Asian immigrants successfully assimilated by a monolingual national school system makes it evident how absurd this statement is. Nothing could be more obvious than the fact that Afro-American experience with Euro-American education -- indeed with inter-ethnic relations in general -- has been radically different. To suggest that the main cause of this difference is linguistic misunderstanding and culture conflict would be manifestly absurd. The plain fact is that not only the "deficit model" but also the basic elements of the "difference model" are well established conceptual patterns of Euro-American culture, common property of educators as well as others. Even though the teachers we have observed in Blackston are generally not linguistically or anthropologically sophisticated, they are thoroughly imbued with the belief that Black people are culturally different from themselves. The notion that adding more accurate content or technical understanding to this belief would somehow motivate teachers or others to treat Afro-Americans with either respect or sympathy is exceedingly naive at best.

This is not only the naivete of the liberal educationist whose approach to Black-White relations has so conspicuously failed to hold the society back from the brink of ethnic civil war. It is also the obscurantism of the behavioral science technician which blocks probing inquiry and insightful interpretation with such thought-deadening notions as the supposed mutual exclusivity of cultural systems or the alleged general incompetence of Afro-Americans in mainstream culture. By creating or perpetuating these intellectual monstrosities, the scholars under criticism here have not merely produced a "difference model" of Black experience. In the name of St. Herskovits they have created a new and pernicious Myth of the Negro Present. Having read William Stewart's work as we began our own study of ghetto idioms, we can testify enthusiastically that the identification of Afro-American linguistic distinctiveness which he pioneered deserves full credit and appreciation.

Beyond this, however, the same conjunction of experiences convinces us that the theoretical extensions of this orientation into a general framework for interpreting Afro-American social life has no relevance -- save an entirely negative one -- to the realities of Blackston.

Turning away from interpretive schemes developed in studies of U. S. Blacks as such, we find one conceptual framework from comparative work which fits our case of an urban Afro-American community and its setting, at least in a broad, general way. This is the model of the "plural society," originated by Furnivall (1948), developed in Caribbean studies particularly by M. G. Smith (1960, 1965), recently reanalysed by Leo Despres (1967, 1968, 1970), and applied comparatively to race relations in several parts of the world under the rubrics "social pluralism" and "cultural pluralism" by Van den Berghe (1967). Despite some significant differences among these formulations, there is a core of agreement on the nature of plural societies. These are systems made up of socially and culturally distinguishable segments, dominant and subordinate collectivities, such as ethnic groups, races, and castes. One recent summary definition states that "the integration of the plural society is based primarily on a system of relationships between differentiated groups of unequal status and power" (Despres 1968:7). Other features commonly associated with pluralistic systems, in varying degrees from one society to another, include lack of value consensus among the constituent segments, some autonomy between the parts of the system balanced by economic interdependence, and often overshadowed by coercion and political domination by one group over others (Van den Berghe 1967:35ff).

Among the issues which divide theorists of pluralism is the question what place and importance conflict has in plural systems. For example Van den Bergh (Ibid.) leans toward the view that some degree of intergroup conflict in endemic in plural societies, while Despres has recently argued that "reduction of competition between culturally distinctive groups" is a salient characteristic of pluralistic social organization (1970:285). Again Van den Berghe treats the United States, South Africa, Brazil, and Mexico all as pluralistic to one degree or another, while Despres contends that development of a modern industrial economy is one condition under which plural social orders cannot survive (Op. cit.:286). The latter argument derives from Despres' choice of ecological adaptation as the principal theoretical concept for interpreting cultural pluralism. In an interesting analysis of Guyanese society he shows that groups of African and East Indian derivation have maintained and developed their respective cultural distinctiveness by adapting to different environmental niches as their northern South American nation has evolved through several centuries. From this viewpoint, it seems to him that the advent of a modern industrial order is "capable of reducing the number of environments to the point where a plural adaptation is no longer possible," and then "it seems, cultural sections must inevitably become extinct" (Ibid.). While this suggestion is not documented, it is nevertheless thought-provoking.

To us it seems self-evident, from evidence already cited and more to be presented below, that Blackston is a microcosm of a plural society.

This community reflects both the social segmentation of class and caste and the cultural differentiation of multi-ethnic diversity which characterize U. S. society as a whole. Since Blackston is part of a major metropolis within a highly developed industrial nation, its pluralism contradicts Despres' contention that industrialism is incompatible with a plural social order. In terms of our purposes at any rate, this suggests some serious weaknesses not only in adaptational ecological theory but also in the concept of pluralism as an interpretive frame of reference. The more specific and interesting constructs of pluralist theory -- such as Despres' ideas of reduced intergroup competition and incompatibility with modern economies -- just do not fit the case of Blackston. On the other hand, to fit Blackston into more generalized conceptions of pluralism (e. g. Van den Bergh's) is not very revealing or productive of fresh insights.

In other words, there seems to be little reason not to agree that Afro-Americans do live in plural societies, but having said this we are not sure we have said very much. This dissatisfaction is probably due, in some part at least, to a major disjunction between pluralist theory and our accumulating evidence. Portrayals of plural societies outside the U. S. generally present their constituent groups as being culturally separate in a way and to a degree that does not match our experience of Blackstonians and their relationship to mainstream White culture patterns. On the other hand, applications of pluralist conceptions to U. S. society -- like that by Van den Berghe cited earlier -- usually give little or no recognition to the ethnic cultural distinctiveness of Afro-Americans as compared with Euro-Americans. In short, it appears that existing conceptions of pluralism fall short of elucidating the complex and subtle interplay of social differentiation and interdependence, cultural separation and sharing which we find in Blackston.

Another possibly relevant formulation from Caribbean studies was initiated by Herskovits and has recently been further developed by Karl Reisman. Some years ago Herskovits (1950, 1958:154-158) began calling attention to a cultural complex which he termed "indirection" and which he believed was characteristic of West Africans and Afro-Americans throughout the New World. He was referring to a series of behavioral tendencies such as indirect and incomplete expression in speech, reserve, reticence, and discretion in interpersonal relations, reluctance to be self-revealing either on an individual basis or in a group sense, and the like. Herskovits associated these patterns with what he believed were underlying Afro-American norms and values more or less masked or hidden by the more overt, explicit expressions of culture.

With particular reference to Creole English and related aspects of culture on the Antillean island of Antigua, Reisman (1970) has elaborated these conceptions by exploring "cultural duality" and "ambiguities of cultural reference." His analysis is too intricate and subtle to be easily and briefly summarized. It involves various processes of "masking," "transvaluation," and "remodeling" of cultural materials ranging from language to certain forms of interpersonal behavior, and conceptions of ethnic identity. Creole speech is presented as the central manifestation -- as well as the prime symbol -- of one side of the cultural duality. This is the low-status and Afro-American side of the dualism, as opposed to the culture patterns of elite and Euro-American provenience or derivation. As Reisman says, "the remodeling of symbols and the maintenance of a dual value system are thus intertwined" (Op. cit.:135). While most of the data reported by this investigator are from Antigua, he is clearly constructing a model which he hopes may be broadly representative of Afro-Americans.

Now there is much in all this which appeals to us as quite comparable to cultural variations and ambiguities we live with every day in Blackston. There certainly can be no doubt that "cultural duality" exists here. Moreover, our local dualism is clearly defined by two poles of cultural configuration which are similar to those posed by Reisman: several Black cultures (low-status, Afro-American) and a dominant mainstream way of life (Euro-American). Moreover, the pan-Afro-American thesis receives some definite support from the fact that certain of Reisman's specific illustrations are duplicated in Blackston. These include larger patterns like the principle of "resignation" to life conditions as they present themselves, or the ambiguous positive-negative assertion of low-status identity with associated deliberately "ignorant" or "stupid" behavior. Correspondences between Reisman's Antigua and our Blackston also include quite detailed specifics of culture, such as the expression of deference in interpersonal relations by averting ones eyes.

Yet ultimately the agreement between Antiguan forms as presented by Reisman and Afro-American life as we experience it in Blackston is more empirical than theoretical, more in the realm of description than in the area of interpretation. Reisman's presentation of Afro-American cultural ambiguity and duality includes a heavy emphasis on the Afro (Creole) element being hidden or secretive with a concomitant stress on West Indians' insistent attempts to present themselves as more Euro-American than they really are. Without any implication that these phenomena do not exist in Antigua, we must report that we do not find them in Blackston. If anything, Blackstonians have a tendency to present themselves overtly as being less competent in European-derived cultural forms than they actually are, as will be made clear below. Moreover, we do not find Afro-Americans generally denying their cultural distinctiveness as such, even though there are contexts in which they find it advantageous to avoid exposing particular adaptations to the scrutiny or appreciation of dominant White authorities and exploiters. Many Blackstonians are ambivalent, inconsistent, sometimes even confused about these matters, but we find little if any of the systematic hiding and masking of ethnic differences described by many Caribbeanists from Herskovits to Reisman.

Perhaps the essence of our difficulty with these notions of culturally ambiguous duality can best be exemplified by our reaction to a specific incident recounted by Reisman (op. cit.:139). He tells us that he was interacting informally with an ordinary five-year-old girl in an Antiguan village, communicating with her in the local creole English. He quotes her as commenting "You talk bad" and proceeding to translate what he said into non-creole English. Now we have had innumerable experiences dynamically equivalent to this one: indeed they occur almost daily and sometimes many times in a single day. With respect to dual enculturation in different systems we certainly agree with Reisman that this kind of event shows "the early age at which both are learned" (Ibid.). Beyond this, however, we find additional meanings in such experiences. For one thing, occurrences of this kind take place with adults as often as with children. For another, these interactions often include a laughing but explicit -- indeed sometimes quite assertive -- recognition that two different cultural systems are involved. On occasion this has reached the point of remarks addressed to the non-Black member of our team such as, "You gettin' to be a regular nigger, man." We seldom meet anyone who gives any indication that they do not recognize contrasts between Euro-American norms and Afro-American patterns.

Moreover, we often observe lengthy and elaborate but spontaneous and more or less public discussions of ethnicity as such. Here we refer not to the structured programs of community organizations with ethnic-nationalist leanings which also are important in the life of Blackston, but rather to informal, unplanned exchanges that occur in the normal course of existence in the neighborhoods. In such contexts, we hear more or less complex and explicit statements as to the nature of Black culture from various ethnic viewpoints. We often find people posing queries and exchanging views on the biological, historical, esthetic, social, and cultural meaning of "Blackness." Recently one of us happened upon a group of men intensely exploring, debating, even acting out the significance of African ancestry to each of them, individually and collectively, and speculating on what would happen if they journeyed to Africa in search of kinsmen. The discussants in this case included persons born and brought up in Cuba, Curacao, Puerto Rico and Surinam. Our near neighbors include ex-seamen who contribute to such discussions various observations they have brought back from Africa and many other parts of the world inhabited by nonwhites, Baptists who propound elaborate theories to support their contention that Blacks are the original Semites, Black Israelites who display an ability to speak Hebrew, Hebraic, and Amharic and who recount convincing tales of finding relatives in Ethiopia. In sum, ethnic variety and even exoticism is not only conspicuous but literally on display in Blackston.

Clearly all this is very much at variance with the picture of Antilleans secretively pretending (to outsiders apparently, to themselves perhaps, to whom really?) that they are more Europeanized than observation would show them to be. So we can certainly see each ethnic group in Blackston as culturally dual and ambiguous in certain senses, but we cannot find the cultural-linguisitic dissimulation reported from Antigua and elsewhere. Our only possible conclusion seems to be that -- ambiguity and duality to be contrary not withstanding -- other or additional social processes are at work among *our* people as compared with West Indians as they are described at home in the islands.

Some further sense of the processes at work here appears to be available from one more study done outside the United States, a perceptive piece on the Afro-English West Indians in the Panama Canal Zone by R. S. Bryce-Laporte (1970). One reason the interpretations put forth in this article may seem especially relevant to our work is that it concerns Black people under White American rule. Another may be that the author, unlike most of the other writers cited here, has been a functioning participant in the human collectivity of which he writes. In any case, he describes his compatriots as a dependent and subordinate Black minority within a "rigidly hierarchical, bureacratic, pluralistic, paternalistic, authoritarian, and totalitarian" system. Because the Canal Zone is essentially a military colonial enclave, these characteristics are perhaps even more marked there than in Blackston, but the difference is one of degree only. Bryce-Laporte writes of "a colonial, conflict-based, plural system," a "two-caste system" which has "persisted despite shared language and tradition" because "while school programs were designed to acculurate West Indians to American culture," the latter are nevertheless "denied commensurate economic access, social status, and political power to control the social determinants of their fate" (Op. cit:114-116). These statements tell us immediately that we are reading about a social system quite comparable to that which we are studying, described by an observer who has seen the same kinds of human phenomena we are presented with every day in Blackston. The same sense of successful communication recurs again when we find this author saying that the Black people have not only "a feeling of ignorance or powerlessness but also /a/ distrust of the superordinate and alien Americans and their judiciary system."

We are therefore more than usually interested when we find Bryce-Laporte asking why ethnic, cultural pluralism should persist even when the subordinate group is constantly being exposed to (not to say overwhelmed by) the culture of the dominant elite. His answer stems from one further description of his people as "total dependents in a closed, single-authority system" therefore "always living on the brink of crisis" (Op. cit.:116, emphasis in original). Bryce-Laporte suggests that people living thus are likely to exist in terms of two sets of cultural norms, one from the dominant, official, or mainstream system, the other from their own ethnically distinctive code. He continues: "Where distance, difference, discrimination, or dislike seem to characterize the relations between the two strata, the subordinate one will tend to consider some cultural aspects of the superordinate as false, foreign, or formal and its own . . . as native and normal." Moreover, this astute observer adds that under the conditions already specified, the oppressed minority is likely to maintain or create its own "contraculture" for group self-protection. This is a distinctive set of values and customs which enable the dominated group, whenever threatened by crisis conditions, to strengthen their response by invoking both "their traditional institutions" and "any new institutions" they may have produced through cultural revitalization (Op. cit.:117, cf. Yinger 1960).

Comparing these statements about Afro-Americans in the Canal Zone with what we know of Blackston, we can only respond in the local vernacular, "This is where its at," or in a slightly more specialized universe of discourse, "Right on,brother!" Nearly everything described by Bryce-Laporte can be replicated here. More concretely, we have come across no evidence in Blackston which challenges the analysis just quoted at some length. Nevertheless, despite the strong perception of positive correspondence produced by Bryce-Laporte's analysis, there is still a residual sense of theoretical incompleteness with respect to our own material.

We feel we have found what is needed to round out our interpretation of Blackston ethnicity in an idea contributed by an anthropologist working in a different but interestingly comparable social context. Steven Polgar (1960) found that people living on an Indian reservation regularly go through a process which he termed "biculturation." That is, they are simultaneously enculturated and socialized in two different ways of life, a contemporary form of their traditional Amerindian lifeways and mainstream Euro-American culture. Whether or not one accepts an implied analogy between Indian reservations and Black ghettos (cf. Willhelm 1969, Deloria 1969), the basic idea has very real relevance for Afro-America. This relevance has been partly recognized or at least alluded to by several of the writers already cited. Yet its implications have not been fully appreciated, nor has its interpretive strength been utilized.

In the cases of Hannerz and Stewart, for example, their own theoretical preoccupations evidently prevent them from making productive use of the concept. Despite a brief recognition by Hannerz that simultaneous enculturation in two sets of lifeways has some relevance to the ghetto 1969b:191-192), his more general view of mainstream patterns among ghetto people has little in common with the concept of biculturation, either as originally proposed (Polgar 1960) or as used in our work. Hannerz explicitly separates "mainstreamers" from other ghetto people, labels them non-typical, and therefore declares that they are of little interest. Dual socialization thus gets lost in the attempt to establish a single ghetto culture. In a recent paper, Stewart (1969b) refers to his own view of Afro-American language as a "bipolar model of the urban Negro speech community," and he suggests that this is a bicultural concept. Yet he continues: "I know, as Hannerz does, that a biculturalism model is only useful for describing the behavior of total communities, and that virtually no individual in these communities can comfortably manage the entire range" (Ibid.:4-5). Thus biculturation is transmuted into a concept asserting mutually exclusive ethnic-cultural collectivies -- nearly the exact opposite of its original meaning.

Among Afro-Americanists, at any rate, the importance of Polgar's concept seems to have been generally underestimated or misunderstood. In our view, biculturation is the essence of the divided identity symbolized by the very name Afro-American and celebrated, dramatized, and lamented by every major Black American artist and scholar from DuBois and White through Ellison and Baldwin to Fanon and Cleaver. Indeed it is paradoxical that Hannerz opens his own book with a quotation from *The Souls of Black Folk* in which DuBois remarks upon the "double-consciousness" and the "twoness" of Afro-American life -- surely a classical statement of biculturation in its original sense. (Neither the quotation nor its source is discussed anywhere in Hannerz' book.)

In any case, biculturation appeals to us strongly as a key concept for making sense out of ethnicity and related matters in Blackston. With this conceptual tool in hand, then, we may state our second major hypothesis. 2. *The collective behavior and social life of the community are bicultural in the sense that each ethnic segment draws upon both a distinctive repertoire of standardized Afro-American group behavior and, simultaneously, patterns derived from the mainstream cultural system of Euro-American derivation.* Socialization into both systems begins at an early age, continues throughout life, and is generally of about equal importance in most individual lives. The obvious ambiguities add ambivalences of all this are dramatized and sharpened by the fact that mainstream Euro-American culture includes concepts, values, and judgements which categorize Blacks as worthy only of fear, hatred, or contempt because of their supposedly innate characteristics. This is part of what radical and nationalistic Afro-Americans mean when they refer to the "brain-washing" of their people.

A striking quality of urban Afro-American communities is their internal cultural variety. Our propositions under hypothesis 2 deal with the dimensions of this variation as they are emerging in the Blackston research. 2.1. Within the community, ethnic groupings are recognized and defined primarily by three criteria: racial identification, linguistic heritage, and national or regional derivation. 2.2. Each group differs significantly from the others in at least one and probably several cultural dimensions. The dimensions of cultural differentiation which appear significant thus far in this connection cover a wide spectrum. These include communication and expressive behavior, material culture, economic patterns, family and kinship systems, community institutions, politics and social movements, supernaturalism, and secular world view.

The other side of all this subgroup variation is opened up by the question what cultural commonalities unite -- or at least mutually attract -- diverse Afro-American elements. Our experience thus far leads us to two tentative propositions stating commonalities at different levels. 2.3. All Afro-American groups have some significant cultural elements in common which contrast with cultural characteristics of groups of non-African derivation. 2.4. North American Blacks share certain cultural constellations which contrast with those of other Afro-Americans. Major aspects of culture in which we are working to replicate or extend the pertinent findings of other scholars include language (Stewart 1962, etc.), expressive patterns (e. g. Abrahams 1964 1969), and social structure (Whitten and Szwed1970b).

As noted earlier, this research is a community study. This means that it will probably cover directly only a quite brief time span of a few years. Moreover, such work is not comparative research except in the special, quite limited sense that it deals with cultural variation only within one community. For these reasons the Blackston research by itself cannot tell us very much directly about the larger developmental questions often dealt with by ethnohistorians of Afro-America. Nevertheless, we do feel that some issues of this sort are at least indirectly relevant to our research. Though working primarily from linguistic data, Stewart (among others) has argued strongly that a single cultural system derived from African roots characterizes all American Negroes. Such students of creolization and syncretism as Crowley and Bourguignon (quoted in Whitten and Szwed 1970b:38)take the position that these phenomena are so diverse that we cannot meaningfully speak of "New World Negro culture" at all. Yet another view is Whitten's argument that important common Afro-American patterns do exist in family organization and other aspects of social structure, but these are derived primarily from parallel and convergent cultural evolution rather than shared African roots (Whitten and Szwed 1970b:36ff).

Our experience in Blackston thus far makes us inclined to feel that these formulations may not really be mutually exclusive but only seem so when stated in extreme terms. At this stage we are finding at least some evidence in our miniature comparison of different ethnic groups that could easily be interpreted to support each of these views. Certainly we expect before we are finished to have rich data bearing on these issues. On the other hand, we refrain from constructing hypotheses on these questions as such. This is because these are essentially historical or evolutionary hypotheses. Testing them effectively would require either greater time depth or broader comparison than our community study can be expected to provide.

The idea of biculturation within a plural social structure clarifies a process we were only able to touch on in considering poverty and culture. That is, it helps explain how people learn and practice both mainstream culture and ethnic subcultures at the same time. Much intra-group socialization is conditioned by ethnically distinct experience, ranging from linguistic and other expressive patterns through exclusive associations like social clubs and recreational establishments to the relatively few commercial products and mass media productions designed for ethnic markets. Yet at the same time, members of all subgroups are thoroughly enculturated in dominant culture patterns by mainstream institutions, including most of the content of the mass media, most products and advertising for mass marketing, the entire experience of public schooling, constant exposure to national fashions, holidays, and heroes. These sources constantly impinge on Afro-American homes which thereby share these enculturation experiences with mainstream America. We also find that Afro-Americans and other poor people receive a constant barrage of mainstream socialization in more specialized forms from other institutions which operate particularly, though not always exclusively, within poverty areas. These include the welfare system, the police-courts-prison complex, anti-poverty programs and other forms of petty political patronage, and various types of employment through which middle-and upper-class patterns are commonly communicated, such as domestic service.

Ethnic subcultural socialization is focused to some degree within family units and primary groups, with much mainstream enculturation coming more from wider sources. Yet this is by no means a sharp or consistent division of socializing influences. Ghetto homes expose their members from earliest childhood to many mainstream themes values, and role models. This occurs not only through behavior of parents and others which reflects mainstream as well as ethnic conditioning, but also through external agencies which constantly operate within most households, such as television. Moreover, Afro-American children typically begin, at least during the third year of life, to be exposed outside the home to such mainstream cultural settings as may be available to ghetto dwellers: movies, amusement parks, children's programs of anti-poverty agencies, church activities, retail shopping, public health services, and others. Experience is thus so structured that Afro-Americans become thoroughly bicultural quite early in their lives.

A good deal of the mainstream cultural content Afro-Americans learn remains latent or potential rather than being actively expressed in everyday behavior. One reason for this is that the structural conditions of poverty, discrimination, and segregation prevent people from achieving many mainstream middle-class values, aspirations, and role models to which they nevertheless give psychologically deeprooted allegiance. It seems that for the subordinate strata in plural systems, enculturation in the dominant way of life may often provide great familiarity with mainstream patterns but little opportunity to practice these patterns actively. In Blackston at any rate, this leads to a condition in which Afro-Americans can seldom actively display their actual competence in mainstream patterns. One result is that Euro-Americans (and sometimes Negroes out of touch with the ghetto) can easily convince themselves that Blacks in poverty areas have no competence in the dominant culture. This conviction in turn becomes a basis or rationalization for continuing discrimination and segregation.

One common pattern of what we call passive enactment of mainstream culture occurs in settings of formalized intergroup contact. Examples include court and commission hearings in which the official personnel are generally middle-class Whites, the proceedings are formally conducted according to mainstream patterns including middle-class American English sometimes augmented by specialized vocabulary, and the defendants or complainants, or both, are Afro-Americans. Numerous direct observations of such proceedings have convinced us that generally the Black participants understand fully what is being done and said. Yet when called upon to speak they tend to confine themselves to Afro-American English idioms. This often leads to confusion, but it is almost invariably the middle-class Whites who misunderstand. The obvious reason for this is that the Afro-Americans are bicultural and bidialectical, whereas the non-Black mainstreamers are generally limited to a single cultural system. In other words, poor Afro-Americans -- far from being either deficient or merely different in culture -- often possess a richer repertoire of varied life styles than their ethnically nondescript social superiors.

6. Inequality Imposed and Institutionalized

Having referred repeatedly to mainstream social and cultural influences on the life of Blackston, it is time to examine directly the structure of connections between the mainstream environment and the local community. Julian Stewart argued years ago, and Arensberg and Kimball agreed, at least in part, that a major weakness of many community studies is their tendency to be carried out "as if the larger society did not exist" (Arensberg and Kimball 1965:41). Steward's point was that few community researchers make serious attempts to show how the larger society affects the unit under study; even less effort is made to conceptualize thoroughly the relationship between the two. (This of course parallels, at a different level of organization, the criticism we have made here and elsewhere of partial ethnographies.) In our Blackston work we are attempting to overcome the weaknesses referred to by Steward. Our effort along these lines involves developing concepts of hierarchical structures which we believe constitute the major links between the local community and the metropolitan and national social systems. In this way we hope to reintroduce notions of stratification in such a way as to avoid the pitfalls of conventional class concepts noted earlier.

The most obvious and direct structural links between Blackston and the larger society are a series of important large-scale institutions. These include the public schools, the police department, the welfare administration, health institutions, mass transit, political machines, other public bureaucracies, and major organizations in the "private" sector such as utilities, retail businesses, places of employment, and sources of credit. These institutions obviously are of enormous and basic importance to the life of Blackston people. Yet, with insignificant exceptions, they are totally controlled from outside the community and generally not even susceptible to any influence from community members. This pattern of institutionalized powerlessness is, of course, one of the main bases for interpreting ghetto life in terms of a colonial analogy, as many radical and some liberal social critics do.

It became obvious early in our work that we must study the structure and processes of these institutions as they affect community members. As will be made clear in a later section, the problem of how to go about this has been one of our thorniest and most time-consuming methodological preoccupations. Indeed, trying to do this makes one appreciate, as perhaps nothing else can, why so few urban ethnographers have made a similar attempt. The point to be made here, however, is that we needed a theoretical framework for this investigation of institutional linkages between the community and the wider society. The framework which we eventually developed grew out of our reconsidering "stratificational" approaches to the poor and minority groups.

The key point here is really quite simple and rather obvious. With few exceptions, the personnel who hold all the more important positions in the relevant institutions operating in Blackston occupy higher positions in national status systems than the vast majority of members of the community which the institutions ostensibly serve. Most of these institutions are staffed by numerous professionals who earn their livings and advance their careers in Blackston, while extremely few of them belong in any way to the community. Conversely, hardly any professional educators, almost no social workers, very few physicians, only a tiny handful of politicians, no bankers, only very small proprietors or employers, and not even very many policemen live in Blackston. Similarly there is little overlap in education, income, or other standard stratificational indices between those who hold essential positions in the institutions and those who make up the community.

There is of course a racial-ethnic dimension of this structure. Virtually all professional and managerial positions in these institutions, plus many of the technical and other highly skilled jobs, are all held by non-Latin Whites. Yet at least 90% of Blackston's citizenry is either non-White and/or Hispano-American. Even among Blackston's own Afro-Americans who do live in the community, there is an ethnically structured hierarchy apparent not only in the big institutions within the community but also in comparable organizations elsewhere in the metropolitan area. Afro-English speakers from the West Indies or with Caribbean backgrounds are proportionally more numerous than their U. S. born cousins in technical semi-professional, and middle-level administrative positions. Afro-Americans from ethnohistorical backgrounds associated with French, Dutch, and Spanish domination appear to turn up with more than chance frequency in roles involving relatively highly rewarded sub-professional statuses such as craftsmen, seamen, and lower-middle level civil servants. The ranks of the minimally skilled unemployed, under-employed, and welfare-dependent are disproportionately swelled by Afro-Americans more or less recently arrived from the southern United States.

If this is the pattern emerging from inductive exploration of the data, no doubt there are various ways in which it might be interpreted. The interpretation we have chosen to test against the incoming evidence is embodied in Hypothesis 3: The community is linked to the wider society through hierarchies of class, ethnic, and racial stratification which are actualized and maintained through the operations of externally controlled institutions within the community. This means that we see three different but interrelated scales of stratification which are supported by mainstream culture and which operate both singly and together to the disadvantage of most Blackston citizens. Moreover, these same institutional expressions of status hierarchies also function to create and sustain invidious comparisons and discriminations between different ethnic categories within the community.

Implications of Hypothesis 3 can be spelled out by specifying some observable results from the operations of particular institutions in the relevant social field. 3.1: Public education in Blackston commands less resources in finance, personnel, expertise, and expectation of achievement by pupils than do the schools of mainstream communities, while at the same time these educational institutions discriminate internally in favor of the very few Euro-Americans and incline to advantages for Hispano-Americans. We suspect they may give relatively preferential treatment to Afro-Americans known to be from the

English-speaking West Indies. It is obvious that they expect least from and give least to children identified as being from the rural southern U. S. and/or dependent on welfare. 3.2: The police quite systematically discriminate, first, on the basis of racial status ("color") but second, and almost equally important, against anyone whom they perceive as unconventional, rebellious, or defiant in relation to a quite narrowly and rigidly conservative version of mainstream cultural values (cf. Chevigny 1969). This definitely means that publicly assertive nationalist or separatist Blacks regularly risk special danger. We are not yet sure what other differential effects this has for particular ethnic groups within the Afro-American collectivity.

3.3: Employers generally discriminate against all Black people in favor of Whites, but wihin this framework they operate in terms of a folklore specifying finer distinctions of ability, deservedness, and so forth which appears to value individuals with apparent Caribbean or Latin American connections above other Blacks, and to prefer Afro-Americans from the northern urban U. S. over those identified with the rural south (except for the most menial positions). 3.4: Retail businesses regularly practice differential standards on a territorial basis which thereby affect communities having large numbers of Afro-Americans, together with whoever happens to reside with them (in our case mainly Hispano-Americans). As shown in an earlier section, the essence of the differential practice in this area is higher prices and lower quality of merchandise. Further patterned generalizations could be specified, and yet others of greater specificity will undoubtedly grow out of the continuing research. The examples already given are sufficient to indicate the nature of the problem.

What kind of larger system stands behind all this, allows it to function as it does, and keeps it going? Our present perspective hardly entitles us to claim any special overall bird's-eye view of the national system. What we can validly assert, however, is a certain experiential qualification for describing how the larger system appears when one is looking outward and up from the Black Ghetto. In the following passages we shall attempt to relate this perspective to some of the more recent views of social stratification in the United States.

In earlier sections, particularly the theoretical introduction, we have already developed our view that the classical notion of social class blurs or obscures important facets of Afro-American social life. Hopefully the intervening pages on ethnic diversity have helped to convey that living in a multi-hued ghetto sharpens ones awareness that the colorless concept of class is a thoroughly gray idea. Nevertheless, a theoretical dilemma remains, for social stratification is clearly one of the great structural realities shaping Afro-American existence. In hopes of finding a more relevant stratificational framework, then, let us examine one recently emerging approach to hierarchical structures in American society. This approach is found in some recent works of the sociologist S. M. Miller, colleagues, and associates.

S. M. Miller et al. analyse poverty in terms of "the over-all stratification of a nation" (Miller and Roby 1969:1). For these scholars "over-all stratification" has five components or dimensions. These are: command over economic resources (or class in one narrow sense); power in its various administrative, bureaucratic, and other political forms; status, including social honor or prestige and self-respect (class in another narrow sense); educational achievement, experience, and opportunity; individual and group mobility. This kind of discussion makes ethnic and racial considerations secondary or even incidental -- in a way which does not square with Afro-American experience. For example, under the heading of "social honor" we are told by Miller et al. that resistance to free choice of residence by Afro-Americans is due both to "class feelings" and to feelings "against Negroes as a status group regardless of class levels" (Miller and Roby 1969:20). The reader gets a feeling that a major expression of the crushing reality of racial discrimination is being reduced to a minor illustration of social "prestige." Other references to ethnic groups and/or racial categories in Miller's discussion are comparable to this one.

This type of analysis tends to imply that the social position and life chances of people within a grouping like Afro-Americans stem largely from the five dimensions of inequality listed earlier. Indeed, it is well known and quite indisputable that various categories of nonwhites in the U. S. do suffer extreme deprivation in income, power, status, and so forth. In this connection, however, the analysis tells us nothing that was not long ago clear about the groups in question. In particular, we learn nothing about why ethnic and racial groups as such are differentially disadvantaged. It is implied that such non-class groupings are themselves somehow ranked in the national social structure. Yet the basic terms of the analysis do not recognize ethnic or racial criteria as such. This makes it appear that the different fortunes of Wasps and Afro-Americans, for example, are somehow byproducts of non-ethnic and non-racial forms of stratification. Our experience in Blackston and elsewhere indicates strongly that a more realistic view would specify that ethnic and racial group assignment are, in themselves, basic criteria for massive discrimination. These criteria are therefore major independent sources of stratification. This crucial social reality not only remains unexplained but is, in effect, largely ruled out of consideration when inequality is discussed in terms of "over-all stratification" as defined by Miller et al.

These discussions by Miller and others do not spell out a detailed structure of social stratification. They do specify definite dimensions of inequality, as already noted. They also imply rather clearly a series of ranked levels to which individuals or groups may be assigned on each dimension. To make explicit other aspects of this system apparently implied by Miller et al., we offer the following outline. The dimensions and levels set forth here are paraphrases of those stated by Miller and discussed by many other authors. The labels given to various positions in the model are offered as only one reasonable way to flesh out some parts of the skeletal structure directly or indirectly indicated by current presentations of the "stratificational approach" to poverty. Since the outline is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive, particular levels are specified only at the extremes of the social hierarchy.

SOCIAL CLASSES

Wealth	Status	Power	Education	Mobility
Great riches	High society	Power elite	Elite training	Immobility at the top
to	to	to	to	to
Extreme poverty	Undeserving poor	Disfranchised poor	Functional illiteracy	Immobility at bottom

This represents a familiar system of socio-economic placement, the essentials of which are common knowledge (even though there could clearly be reasonable debate about the particular phraseology chosen to portray it). Now if we ask how various racial and cultural groups are distributed through this system, it is immediately apparent that there are many significant inter-ethnic contrasts. The peaks of White Anglo-Saxon Protestant privilege are simply not reached by Afro-Americans. Nor are the depths of Black deprivation and oppression known to Wasps. This is true even though a few Blacks are relatively privileged and a minority of Wasps are immobilized in poverty. The lowest levels of "over-all stratification" are plentifully occupied by Afro-Americans but only scantily populated by Whites. There are whole strata at the upper end of the scale which have no significant Black membership. The big bulges in Wasp distribution are all around the middle section of the structure, while the largest proportions of Afro-Americans are found at the base of each stratified dimension. The reader can easily imagine comparable distributional patterns for relatively privileged non-Wasp groups like Southern and Eastern Europeans or Jews -- or for less fortunate ethnic-racial categories sharing some of the lower reaches of the structure, like Hispano-Americans from various parts of the hemisphere, or native Amerindians.

The next question is how can the larger pattern be more realistically portrayed? The answer that occurs to us is not so much that Miller and associates should be refuted, but rather that their limited model should be transcended and incorporated in a broader understanding. One way to do this begins with explicitly redefining the "over-all stratification" of Miller et al. as corresponding only to the system of social classes as such, without relevance to non-class criteria of stratification. To this we must then add two other coequal major dimensions of inequality. The first is ethnic standing, as defined by cultural derivation and identification. The second is racial status, as defined by various reputedly biological criteria, their social correlates, and their cultural evaluations. These dimensions are outlined below. Again there is no contention that these outlines are the only reasonable way to picture ethnic and racial inequality in the United States. The intent is rather to portray the outlines of the system as a whole, again filling in details only at the extremes of the parallel hierarchies.

ETHNIC STRATA

Ethnohistory	Language	Nationality	Religion	"Life Style"
Ethnic dominance	English or European	British or North European	Protestant Christian	Protestant ethic
to	to	to	to	to
Genocide & enslavement	"Primitive," "non-standard"	Denied or Submerged	"Pagan" or segregated	"Primitive," "pathological"

RACIAL CASTES

Physique	"Lineage"	"Bodily Qualities"	"Mental Qualities"	Legal Status
White	"Pure" White	Beauty, grace, health	Intelligence, talent, character	Full citizen, valued alien
to	to	to	to	to
Black	"Pure" Black	Ugliness, strength, sexuality	Laziness, humor, rhythm	Slave, non-citizen, pseudo-citizen

A few comments can be made on these two hierarchies, with particular reference to the bottom of each dimension where Afro-Americans and other nonwhites are concentrated. It should be clear, to begin, with, that the ethnic strata are defined in cultural terms, thus avoiding the common confusion of ethnic group and race. The dimension of ethnohistory represents the culture-moulding historical experience of an ethnic collectivity as a people. The aspect of ethnohistory most relevant to contemporary stratification is the long-term ethnic supremacy enjoyed by Wasps and other Whites compared with the conquest, slavery, and later forms of domination suffered by Native Americans, Afro-Americans, and others. With respect to linguistic heritage, mainstream U. S. culture defines African and other non-European languages as inferior by labeling them "primitive." This Euro-American conceit persists despite vigorous assertions by linguists that all human tongues are equally worthy of respect as media for communication. Contemporary ethnic speech patterns, such as Afro-English dialects, are despised as debased forms of European languages. This dialectical chauvinism is likewise maintained regardless of the linguists' assurance that "non-standard" speech posseses its own fully adequate structure and communicative power.

When strangers whose ethnicity is not obvious meet in the U. S., probably the commonest device for overtly identifying social placement is the question, "What's your nationality?" For Euro-Americans, national derivation or extraction means identification with a cultural unit that is admired and respected, at least for past glories, if not for contemporary reasons. Mainstream culture even grants a somewhat similar positive valuation to certain Asian nationalities. Amerindians and especially Afro-Americans, on the other hand, are generally regarded as having no national heritage at all, historically. As contemporary groups they are treated as if they had been absorbed into U. S. nationality.

The various monotheistic religions which originated in the Middle East and developed historically through the interplay between that region and Europe are all clearly ranked in the higher and middle levels of ethnic stratification. Euro-American traditions grant considerable respect to selected "great religions" of South Asia and East Asia as well. African and Native American supernatural heritages are relegated to the altogether different category of primitive paganism. Then of course Black Christians in the U. S. were separated, either officially or informally into segregated denominations, where most of their descendants still remain. In mainstream eyes, the patterns of belief and forms of worship maintained by Afro-Americans appear as debased Christianity, religiously analogous to the linguistic category of "sub-standard" English.

Other ethnically distinctive aspects of culture are summed up in the reputed "life styles" of various groups. Elaborate popular stereotypes and even more elaborate academic writings richly define and generally celebrate the lifeways of the various European nationalities recognized in mainstream culture. Descendants of Africans and Amerindians, on the contrary, are popularly believed to remain close to "primitive" and "savage" lifeways. Learned disquisitions on the contemporary life styles of these groups predominantly describe them as "disorganized" and "pathological." Prime examples are the supposed matriarchy, putative battle of the sexes, and allegedly unhealthy child rearing practices associated with Afro-Americans.

The criteria whereby ethnic groups are ranked in the mainstream culture of the United States, are like the corresponding elements of the class system, a mixture of objective and subjective criteria. The long story of genocide and enslavement imposed upon nonwhites is historical reality. There are numerous complex objective differences between Afro-American and Euro-American cultures. The culturally determined interpretations, judgements, and valuations which convert these realities into bases for an ethnic hierarchy, however, are of course subjective. The combined significance of all these judgemental criteria and invidious comparisons -- as applied to the most despised groups -- is to deny that they possess any genuine, legitimate, or worthy cultural heritage of their own.

The mix of objective and subjective criteria by which racial castes are ranked is even more heavily weighted toward judgemental valuations independent of factual conditions. The very concept of race itself is a series of ideal types which break down completely when the actual distribution of their supposed biological elements is examined carefully (Brace, Hierneaux, Livingstone in Montagu 1966). The fact that race is not a scientifically valid biological concept has no social significance, however. Races are quite real social groupings, created and maintained by stratified intergroup relationships, and supported by mainstream racial ideology.

Most of the particular dimensions of caste stratification depend on popularly conceived biological reference points. The core concepts here refer to phenomena of physical appearance, particularly skin color, facial features, and hair characteristics. The code terms white and black have little to do with shades or colors in any physical or optical sense. The real meaning of these "color" concepts lies rather in the deep and elaborate symbolism attached to darkness and light in Middle Eastern and European cultural traditions. Indeed, there is a whole spectrum of symbolic racial colors including yellow, red, and brown as well as the polar shades. This symbolic folk biology also defines the dimension of reputed lineage or family history. The most striking criterion of mainstream culture in this respect is the rule that even the smallest degree of known African ancestry defines an individual as Negro. Along with this go a ranked series of folk concepts related to notions about racial "mixture" and "purity" (these too no longer have any standing in scientific biology). Popular stereotypes of supposedly innate racial qualities of mind as well as body are clearly included in the same system of beliefs. These stereotypes are tied again to the complex of color symbolisms, with all that is most negative and threatening attached to blackness.

The caste hierarchy is further expressed in the patterns of legal status. As national and regional legal systems have been modernized over the past century, the under-caste status of Afro-Americans has been progressively deleted from the formal record of legislative statutes and judicial decrees. Despite the official granting of many "civil rights," however, the informal legal system which actually governs most people"s lives has changed little for the masses of Afro-Americans. The debt-peonage of sharecropping is hardly distinguishable from plantation slavery in degree of real freedom. The police continue to exercise summary corporal punishment, including execution, in the streets and homes of Northern urban as well as Southern rural Afro-American communities. The proliferation of formal proclamations supposedly establishing "freedom of residence" over the last quarter-century has been accompanied by steadily increasing racial segregation of actual communities, with an ever deepening ghettoization of Afro-Americans. In short, recent changes in legal status are not only restricted to the level of formal codes; for the most part they are either irrelevant or simply unreal in the vast majority of individual existences.

Class discrimination and snobbery have long been recognized as important sources and supports of social stratification in the United States. Recently even elite spokesmen for the national establishment have announced their willingness to admit that Euro-American bigotry sustains racial inequality. It must be added that cultural prejudice expressing and supporting ethnic stratification is equally important. The national structure of triple inequality includes not only classism and racism but also ethnicism.

This threefold system of inequalities is enshrined in the major social categories of mainstream Euro-American culture and actualized through the operations of national and metropolitan institutions, especially as they operate within ghettoes like Blackston. Each of the three subsystems confers differential access and control over essential social, cultural, and psychological resources ranging from income and occupation to political power and group self-respect. Moreover, the advantages and disadvantages conferred by each of the three hierarchies are in fact combined, so that the overall position in the society as a whole is at least roughly clear for any particular social category. Thus upper-class Whites of Northern European extraction occupy the top positions in the total system by virtue of controlling a unique combination of class-associated resources, ethnohistorically derived cultural legitimacy, and culturally defined racial acceptability. The Afro-American poor and/or the Native American poor are at the bottom because, not only do mainstream institutions subject them to a unique degree of deprivation in terms of class-associated resources, but at the same time mainstream culture declares them both culturally unworthy and racially inferior in the extreme.

This larger structure of inequality impinges upon Blackston through major institutions which function in terms of a metropolitan and wider power system. These power relations generally place the local community at a severe disadvantage. Public service agencies, for example, while ostensibly designed to serve community needs are in fact controlled from power centers far removed from the community. Blackston is thus a subordinate part of what has recently been analyzed as an "urban empire" (Kotler 1969:13ff). One of the most concrete indications of this power system is that the administrative areal boundaries of public institutions are set in remote decision-making centers from city hall to Washington. The fact that virtually none of these boundaries correspond to the actual limits of Blackston expresses the fact that external power centers do not recognize the existence of the community as such. Two patterns emerge from these conditions. In one, all of Blackston is swallowed up in a single administrative or representative district so large that it is dominated by other communities, typically areas of largely Euro-American population. In the other more frequent pattern, Blackston is divided into two or more separate jurisdictions with its dismembered parts annexed to different neighboring areas. In these instances, each external agency divides the local community differently, producing a veritable crazyquilt of mutually inconsistent jurisdictions. Obviously this situation makes it most difficult for the community as a unit to exert united pressure in behalf of its interests.

Both patterns are prominent in the arena of formal representative politics. Blackston has essentially no direct representation in the city government. The metropolitan legislative body which might provide such representation operates in terms of a large jurisdiction in which this community is so submerged that successful candidates inevitably owe their election primarily to ethnically different areas. Indeed there is virtually no community contact with this so-called representative. The state legislature, on the other hand, has gerrymandered the community into three representative districts. In this arrangement two portions of Blackston are artifically attached to overwhelmingly Euro-American, heavily middle-class areas. The third part is merged with neighboring Black ghetto areas; it is ruled by a state legislator who is an obvious tool of an external party machine, consistently working against initiatives for community self-determination in his various positions from the local scene to the state capital. Congressional "representation" is again more like the metropolitan pattern. These structural forms seem perfectly consistent with the following facts. During the past year and a half we have closely followed every major popular attempt in Blackston to appeal to the community's supposed representatives on these and other political bodies. Not one of these local initiatives has met with any tangible success.

The functions of hospitals and related institutions serving the local populace are governed through a similar hodgepodge of externally imposed health areas, health center districts, ambulance service jurisdictions, and the like. It is consistent with this structure that discrimination against Blacks and Latins of our community is gross and frequently involves matters of life and death. The ethnic hierarchy of power and employment within these institutions has already been described in an earlier section. The most dire effects are of course those suffered by patients. We have observed many instances of openly discriminatory policies of admission and treatment. Euro-Americans, sometimes with no more than obviously minor ailments or injuries, commonly walk freely into emergency wards while crowds of Black and Brown people, sometimes including infants with high fevers, are made to wait, often for hours at a time. We have direct knowledge of at least three infant deaths occurring in close association with these circumstances. Under non-emergency conditions also we have watched hospital staff admit Euro-American patients first when they could not have been unaware that Afro-Americans were there first.

Extensive contacts with psychiatric professionals serving Blackston have convinced us that the following orientations are so general as to be virtually universal among them. There is a strong tendency to assume that Afro-American families and poverty-stricken homes are highly productive of gross psychopathology. Yet the men who believe this typically have had no firsthand contact whatever with the communities about whose members they so confidently generalize. We have observed clinical interviews in which dire diagnoses were clearly being formulated in large part because of the clinician's ignorance of his patient's social and cultural world. For example, it appears that specialists ranging from psychiatrists to speech therapists regularly impute severe disorder to individuals who are merely expressing themselves competently in Afro-American linguistic patterns. We have seen medical men deduce hallucinations from verbalizations which we knew by direct observation merely described literal experiences in the patient's life. Similarly, we can document cases in which diagnoses of psychosis and recommendations for commitment were based heavily upon the supposed effects of traumatic events which never occurred but somehow made their way into the patient's record through misunderstandings on the part of professionals. One of these medical authorities told us he believes there are upwards of 30,000 psychotic children in Blackston and neighboring slums. Another informed us that functionally normal behavior in community, neighborhood, or family settings must be disregarded as irrelevant if diagnostic procedures within the confines of the clinic appear to show disorder.

Perhaps the class of institutions which has the most significant long-range effect, because of their universal impact on the young, are the public schools. In Blackston the schools are administered by three separate districts under the remote but powerful supervision of a central city board of education. Two of these local administrative units are dominated by the preponderant influence of White populations which constitute the overwhelming majority in both districts. The third district is a small one entirely within Blackston, including about one-third of its schools and constituting a special case. Here community people have recently established some beginnings of local control which will be described briefly in the section on change below.

In the first two school districts, the following situation prevails. There are no Black or Puerto Rican principals or other important supervisors, and only a few Afro-American teachers (hardly any of whom live in Blackston). The student population, on the other hand, is solidly Black and Spanish -- totally so in most schools, overwhelmingly so in a couple of instances near the edge of the community. Thus while the central authorities claim to maintain these district boundaries in the name of "integration" and "racial balance," there are in fact virtually no Euro-American children attending Blackston schools. This is accomplished by a system of attendance zones for elementary schools, feeder patterns for secondary schools, and permissive transfer policies which insure that no White child is required to get his schooling in Blackston.

A concrete instance of how these externally manipulated policies defeat local intiatives is among the most immediate sources of contemporary community pressure for change (see next section). This occurred as the culmination of a struggle over many years by Blackston parents to have an integrated educational institution created near the southern boundary of the community. One such plan was overruled in favor of a scheme in which vacant city-owned land was delivered over to outside economic interests to become the site of an industrial park.

Eventually the city board of education agreed to build a junior high school just inside Blackston with specific assurances that its students would come from an ethnically heterogeneous group of elementary schools on both sides of the community boundary. Yet when the new junior high opened up some four years ago, the feeder patterns had been mysteriously altered to perpetuate the old boundaries, and there has been no change since then.

It has already been noted that we have had a great many occasions to observe the educationists, who make their careers in these schools, interacting with local children and their parents. In settings ranging from classrooms to counseling sessions to confrontations with community forces, these professionals express highly standardized beliefs and feelings about ghetto children, their families, and their community. Key items in this inventory include both explicit and implied statements that local children are psychologically or culturally different from American norms, that the differences impede or prevent learning, that the school should function to wipe out these contrasts, but that educators can expect little success in this aim because contrary influence from parents and community defeat the best efforts of the school. In effect and often with blatant openness, the failures of ghetto schools are rationalized by blaming them on pupils and their families. Certain situations of intergroup confrontation, as when parents challenge the outsiders' beliefs and attitudes in public meetings, often cause the Euro-American professionals to become highly emotional in their defensive replies. Under these conditions, it is quite clear that their attitudes are backed by very strong negative emotions which are frequently displayed as obvious race hatred and blatant class antagonism. In the more everyday settings of class, lunchroom, and playground, the children are regularly exposed to the educators' apathy, unconcern, lack of positive expectation, and penalities for independent or creative thinking that have now been thoroughly documented for schools in many other ghetto communities (cf. Leacock 1969).

7. Change and the Future

From portions of earlier sections it must be clear that Blackston is a dynamic community which is very much part of the contemporary resurgence and revitalization of Afro-Americans and other non-European groups in the United States. Here we propose to summarize some dynamic local developments not dealt with earlier and to make a trial formulation as to the overall shape of these tendencies toward change. Our perspective for this portion of the discussion derives but little from academic theories of change. A certain weariness with theories of limited range is combined here with a certain disposition to reserve judgement on widely discussed issues of grand theory until both our data gathering and our thinking have developed further. The perspective then is that of our current living experience, augmented by a continuing effort to keep up with what is going on in other Afro-American communities, and conditioned by a strong value judgement that change to do away with inequality is both necessary and desirable.

Earlier sections have described the structure and activities of organizations related in one way or another to social change, such as the Panthers, the New Africans, and the local Community Council. Here the focus will rather be on the events and processes of what has been the principal movement for change over the past few years. In Blackston, as in many other communities recently in ferment, this is the movement for local community control over major institutions. Its principal target thus far has been the public schools.

In Blackston the demand for local power and authority has grown out of a mounting and increasingly widespread conviction that control centralized in metropolitan bureaucracies consistently neglects and discriminates against community interests. Many leaders and followers of the contemporary movement have gone through arduous earlier phases in which integrated schools were the goal, in which compensatory education was proffered as a solution, or the central authorities proclaimed some other solution. All the major deficiencies of the educational establishment remain unchanged in spite of this. Many people have concluded that external authority will not serve local needs because it seeks to preserve the metropolitan and national system of inequality. The central demand of the movement for community control is accordingly that local institutions must become accountable to the people whom they are supposed to serve. The stated goal is to make the institutions responsive to the issues of quality service and relevance to local needs.

After lengthy agitation and many setbacks, an initial breakthrough was achieved some two and a half years ago. Central authorities granted temporary recognition on an experimental basis to a locally elected community school board in one peripheral part of Blackston. This is the smallest of the three school districts described in the last section; we shall here call it District One. The organizers of this local initiative included formerly integrationist clergymen, secular civil rights activists turning to the community control movement, and other community leaders both from Blackston and from a neighboring ghetto.

Events soon made it plain that the central educational bureaucracy had never made clear the extent or limits of the powers held by the local school board. As soon as this board began to threaten major interests -- such as the power of the educational establishment and the educators' professional associations to set qualifications and dictate appointments -- massive resistance arose outside the community. First there was a local teachers' strike, and then the teachers struck the schools of the whole city over a period of months. The conflict was thus escalated into a bitter citywide struggle. Groups advocating local control in minority communities all over the metropolitan area supported Blackston's District One. Most other public forces from the city government to the mass media to organized labor joined the other side. This powerful opposition mobilized around three major contentions: the local board was said to be denying due process to teachers and other employees, the community control movement was portrayed as a tool of political extremists threatening the unity of the city, and Afro-American activists were held up as apostles of reverse racism. (As close observers of many relevant settings ranging from inner councils of local leadership to street confrontations, we could find no evidence to substantiate these charges.) Considerable hysteria became evident in Euro-American neighborhoods, and rather general unrest developed in the city as the schools remained closed month after month. The city stationed several thousand police in District One, and there were massive confrontations between these forces and local citizen demonstrators.

A notable achievement of the local board and its supporters was that through all this turmoil they kept the District One schools open and functioning. The central municipal authorities perhaps were impressed with the mood and strength of popular support for the local movement. Whether for this reason or others, they never quite imposed ultimate repression through total control of the area and populace by force, though we observed many tense situations in which this appeared to be an imminent possibility. Another major factor in keeping the schools open was that the local board had recruited a multi-racial (though predominantly White) teaching staff which was independent of the main teachers' organizations and loyal to the local administration.

Elsewhere in Blackston (and most of the rest of the city as well) the schools were locked up tight through support of the teachers' strike by the principals' association and the custodians' union. As the situation dragged on, people began to see the strike as a vehicle for outside interests directed against the community. Spontaneous coalitions between the community council, parents' associations, and others who wanted to see the children back in school arose to take neighborhood action. These groups physically opened and occupied one school after another until every Blackston school was in community hands. Skeleton staffs were put goether from dissident teachers and local citizens. The reopenings were publicized, local support for community action grew, and many pupils came back to school. All this occurred in the face of teachers' picket lines which were often threatening especially to children, frequent open hostility from the police, and other forms of external pressure. Well before the end of the strike, all Blackston schools were functioning, albeit with curtailed programs and reduced enrollments.

Similar developments took place in many parts of the city, particularly but not exclusively in minority areas. Soon after more than half the schools in the whole city had been reopened by citizen action, the strike was over. It ended with an agreement between the city government and the educationist association to curb the power of the Blackston District One local regime. Nevertheless many citizens saw this as a victory for community forces, believing that the main factor ending the strike was the inability of the teachers and their allies to keep most of the schools closed. Moreover, the District One local board and its administration remained in office, despite an original strike demand that they be removed. In fact, the local board was not a party to the settlement, and it continued to defy both the agreement and certain subsequent directives from the central authorities.

Elsewhere in Blackston central control was re-established without local resistance, the aim of most citizen activists having been limited to the short-range goal of getting public education going again. Nevertheless, substantial numbers of local people had participated in an exercise in community power, even though many or perhaps most previously had little connection with the cause of community control as such. A portion of the populace now had experience which made that movement more real to them. Most Blackstonians outside District One had earlier been largely ignorant of what was happening in that part of the community. Now more people became aware of achievements under that local board: increased parent involvement, much higher teacher expectations for success by students, bilingual curricula for Spanish-speaking children, large numbers of Afro-Americans and other minority persons in administrative and supervisory positions, and various special programs in reading and other basic skills that all too generally fail to get across in the regular public schools.

In District One, further developments emerged from the crisis. Historically this locality had had little neighborhood consciousness, being a thoroughly depressed area sometimes described as a no man's land between Blackston and a neighboring ghetto. Now the common experience of aggressive and powerful external opposition was beginning to create a response of positive local identity and, to a lesser extent, some sense of commonality with Blackston as a whole. These perceptions and feelings have not swept massively over the entire populace in any neighborhood or in the community at large. The changes have been only relative and far from total. Direct involvement in the movement for community control has remained confined to an activist minority. The passivity of the inactive majority reflects the influence of incomplete and conflicting information sources, a widespread tendency to avoid public confrontations with powerful authorities, and a general preoccupation with the everyday problems of existence which are so often overwhelming in the ghetto. Intensive experience with this situation indicates that this majority is largely neutral, uninvolved, or passively supportive rather than hostile to the community control movement. The only known organized opposition has no more than a small following. Being headed by a local machine politician, the strength of this faction's threat to the community movement lies not in its numbers but in its connections with external power centers.

Further insight into the dynamics of the movement is possible if we consider some relevant interrelations between ethnic distinctiveness and interethnic collaboration. The effort to build a locally controlled school district has been a conspicuously and self-consciously multi-ethnic enterprise. The elected membership of the local board includes Afro-Americans from both the southern and northern U. S., Guyanese, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Whites. If we include top administrators hired by this board, additional categories include Afro-English West Indians, Chinese, and Black Jews. An appreciable number of these people happen to have intergroup marriages and multi-ethnic kindreds. More than two-thirds of the teaching staff are Euro-Americans, about half of them Jewish. Most are young people attracted to their jobs by sympathy with the community cause. A few have come to live in the ghetto; many more have joined local citizens in street demonstrations at considerable risk of police aggression. There is much explicit local pride in this non-racial, anti-racist character of the movement.

None of this has prevented ethnically assertive organizations from supporting the local movement. For example, both the Black Panther Party and the Republic of New Africa gave conspicuous public support, particularly during the more critical stages of confrontation with outside authority. There were clearly at least two kinds of factors which made it possible for such groups to collaborate with other community forces as diverse as moderate or conservative clergymen and church people, Puerto Rican nationalists, and apolitical school mothers. First, all could agree on a core of common interest in the concept of community control. Second, each group welcomed the opportunity not only to display its commitment to community interests but also to communicate its own ideology and solutions for community problems to large audiences. Tacit understanding and consent by all sides on these matters was manifested at rally after rally where each organization both pledged its support to the local school board and at the same time proclaimed its own doctrines and often sought recruits to its programs as well.

On the other hand, intergroup dynamics in relation to community initiatives may become quite complex and problematical at the level of neighborhood institutional operations. Probably quite typical in this respect is the following case of an elementary school, in Blackston but outside District One, which we were able to observe most closely as neighborhood parents opened it up and got it running during the strike. The group who took this initiative consisted almost exclusively of U. S. Afro-Americans, mainly Southerners but also some Northerners. One Puerto Rican woman who has no children in the school but maintains friendships with Black families participated fully. A second Puerto Rican mother whose children do normally attend this school, and who is employed by BCC, was sent by her employer to help the neighborhood effort but did not have her children attend; she was distrusted and vaguely suspected of being a spy for the opposition. No other Latins took any part in the reopening, and all West Indians and others in the school attendance zone stayed out of the entire affair.

Of the small band of teachers and educational aids who crossed the union picket lines and voluntarily returned to the school, all but one White woman and one West Indian were Black North Americans. The teachers' picket lines were absolutely non-Black, while the parents' counter-line included no Latins or West Indians. Although several hundred children attended the school more or less regularly for several weeks after the reopening, only two Latin families sent their children in. So far as we could determine without being personally acquainted with every family in the attendance zone, no non-Latin West Indians or members of other ethnic groups attended the school for the remainder of the strike's duration. All West Indians known to us in the neighborhood were among the large number of people (which included members of all other ethnic groups as well) who preferred to stay clear of a controversial and conflict-ridden situation. None of the several Puerto Rican officers of the PTA (including the president) ever joined the neighborhood effort. The Afro-American teacher who normally had the major faculty responsibility for school-community relations functioned as the acting principal. The Latin school employee whose job description designed her as a community-liaison specialist did not appear until the strike was over.

The entire exercise in neighborhood initiative became virtually an exclusively Black-North-American enterprise. As this situation developed, various organizations and institutions became involved, and each of these involvements had ethnic overtones. The community council supported the neighborhood initiative in a number of ways. Several leaders of BCC -- all of them Black, but not all North Americans -- intervened to persuade Puerto Rican and other Latin parents to take part. This effort failed conspicuously. Rumors circulated (particularly but not exclusively among Spanish-speakers) to the effect that the reopened school was now only for Blacks and that Latin children attending had been beaten up or chased away. We could find no evidence to substantiate these stories, but it was fairly clear that one source of the rumors was striking teachers. Soon a leader of the strikers contacted the Irish priest at the local Roman Catholic Church. Before long a small number of the White teachers were leaving the picket line to take part in a "special school" improvised in the basement of the church. The few sessions held here were attended exclusively by Latin children. Eventually important leaders in BCC, several of them Catholics, successfully prevailed upon the parish priest to discontinue this "school."

Other connections between this neighborhood crisis and larger ethnically implicated organizations were only indirect, merely projected in the minds of participants, or not even known to most people directly involved. When the teachers' picket line, supported by the more or less open collaboration of the police force, threatened to cut attendance seriously by intimidation of children and parents, there were recurrent suggestions that someone should get the Black Panthers to provide a protective counterforce. As it turned out, however, no one knew how to contact the Panthers. During the few weeks of incipient community control, the Afro-American teaching staff organized outdoor recess and playtime for the students, something always banned by the regular administration on grounds of inadequate outdoor space and insufficient supervisory staff. Following the end of the strike, one measure adopted by the returning administration to ingratiate itself with the community was a promise by the principal to prevail upon the local urban renewal agency to provide playground space immediately. Whether the principal knew it or not, a major reason why this plan could not come to fruition was that, at that time, the urban renewal office was marking time and doing nothing at all in the expectation of being taken over by Model Cities -- with an expected general changeover of personnel believed to be dictated in some part by ethnic considerations.

During all this there were quite a few neighborhood discussions of the ethnic implications of the strike and its sequelae. When the strike was over, Latin matrons suddenly dominated the PTA. The majority of the Black mothers who had participated in the community takeover were then either employed as paraprofessionals in the school and/or given important second-rank positions in the PTA, and most quickly became pawns of the school administration. The remaining minority of Afro-American parents active during the strike were ostracized and stigmatized as troublemakers. A few months later, however, this latter group did some organizing and took over the leadership of the PTA in the regular biennial election. Today only one Latin mother holds a minor office in the association, and she was put in by the successful insurgents in gesture that was something of an afterthought.

This new leadership is dominated by Afro-Americans with lifelong experience in the northern urban United States. They inaugurated a parents' and citizens' newsletter which has attempted to challenge the school administration by representing a wide spectrum of community views. They also initiated a petition campaign (succeeding in getting a significant minority of Spanish signers) to demand that the school hire a Black or Puerto Rican guidance counselor to replace the Euro-American incumbent. Afro-Americans from outside the U. S. have played no part in these moves; Southern Blacks and Latin citizens have played only passive or peripheral roles.

Partly because so many varied constituencies are involved, and despite the consensus already described, one finds the ideology and ultimate aims of the movement for community control variously defined and expressed. Many neighborhood participants simply hope that local branches of particular institutions will be brought up to mainstream standards as these are understood locally. Some leaders envision a more broadly revitalized community in which democratic procedures will insure that all institutions serve the common good in terms of local interests. For many, the necessary first step is an inward-turning assertion and construction of local solidarity, which often carries at least mildly separatist or exclusionist overtones. One formulation that has recently emerged locally along these lines is a rhetorical redefinition of "ghetto" as a synonym of "family." This formulation carries multiple meanings. It attaches a positive significance to a previous negative term, invokes the unity implied by a kinship image, and further hints at forceful group self-protection by playing on the overlapping meanings of "The Family," Cosa Nostra, and "our thing." A parallel conception recently projected here is the idea that community control means no more than the justice of people taking charge of the space they have been forced to occupy -- together, of course, with whatever assets and improvements happen to be located there.

None of this is necessarily inconsistent either with internal cultural pluralism or with visions of external linkages as wide as the Third World. In the very same community meetings where the above images are invoked, for example, we find the following orientations also being expressed. Chairmen or masters of ceremonies may make a special point of welcoming people whose native tongue is French or Spanish as well as Afro-English speakers, and the official recognition of all these languages by schools and other institutions may be demanded. In the same setting, speaker after speaker may emphasize and reemphasize the national and international unity of Black people, indeed of all non-Europeans.

Some radical proponents of community control suggest a rather more specific projection of the concept into future developments. Black Panther spokesmen may move easily from local control of schools to the people taking over police forces and health institutions, and on to a socialist revolution for all. Orators for the Republic of New Africa project a carefully detailed vision in which local accountability of public institutions is a step toward total community self-determination; this in turn would be followed by the peaceful creation of a sovereign Black nation. While such programs may sound utopian or disingenuous to outsiders, they are by no means dismissed or scorned by everyone in Blackston. On the contrary, large community audiences accord rapt attention and enthusiastic applause to lengthy lessons on the steps from community control either to nationhood or to revolution.

Beneath the surface of local struggles for control over particular institutions, then, there moves an intricate interplay of constituencies and ideologies. The movement simultaneously expresses both in-group assertion and intergroup cooperation for communal ends. It is at once intensely local, yet linked into networks of metropolitan, regional, and national initiatives for change (cf. Freedomways 1968, Kotler 1969, Spiegel 1968, 1969). Along with all this, the movement also expresses important values and ideals that are common to the traditions of mainstream Euro-American culture. These include the stress on community democracy and local self-reliance, the conception of education as a universal key to self-fulfillment and respect, and the belief that all institutions should serve the community and protect the citizenry rather than prey upon them. It is an open question what this wide spectrum of interests and directions, in Blackston and elsewhere, may hold for the future. We may have here the ingredients of a universalistic movement against inequality. Yet it may also be that this diversity will lead to factionalism and irremediable disunity if the central issues become broader than local problems on which agreement is relatively easy.

Clearly, processes of change in Blackston are outcomes of interactions between forces within the community and conditions of the surrounding society. One product of such multiple influences appears to be a long-term trend with respect to ethnic identity among Afro-Americans. The historical and structural context of this trend is set by the fact that most of the populace are immigrants or children of immigrants, either from the southern states or from the Caribbean region. There is a dominant tendency for Black people coming here to become assimilated to the bicultural social life of northern urban Afro-America. In other words, ethnic identities and allegiances rooted in the U. S. South or elsewhere in the New World tend to decline in importance from one generation to the next. This does not mean that variants of Afro-American culture disappear suddenly or that ties with distant homelands are rapidly severed. On the contrary, former and ancestral ethnic affilications are well remembered and seldom denied. This commonly applies to a span of four generations, and in a smaller number of instances it extends over five or even six generations. Moreover, many immigrants and their children maintain ties to distant areas through communication and contact, often including visits to former homes. Nevertheless, ethnic identities associated with other regions definitely tend to become secondary to the local cultural patterns, especially in relation to life within Blackston.

This trend can be seen from various kinds of evidence including observation of everyday behavior and associations, genealogical data, and life history materials. Except for the most recent newcomers, ethnically exotic behavior tends to be age-graded in the following ways among others. It is mainly mature adults and eldery people born and brought up elsewhere who belong to social clubs with memberships confined to particular ethnic or regional subgroups, spend their leisure only with ethnic compatriots, and make fewest modifications in their traditional speech patterns. Young adults, while not usually distinctive in the ways just noted, are likely to follow regional food tastes, to betray their origins in their speech and other expressive behavior even though they are intelligible to native-born northern Afro-Americans, and to show only a minor tendency to associate with compatriots. At the level of teenagers, general behavior tends to be ethnically indistinguishable, and associations not dictated by older people are likely to be ethnically indiscriminate, at least within the Afro-American category as a whole.

Thus most Blackston citizens are at one stage or another being acculturated into the local bicultural system, with all the dualities, ambiguities, and ambivalences that this implies. This is fundamentally different from the experience of the European immigrant groups who remain bicultural only for a brief transitional portion of their intercultural careers and who may achieve complete social assimilation if they choose to do so. For them, racial identity is no bar to assimilation, and ethnic-cultural identity can be shed voluntarily. For Europeans, moreover, learning mainstream U. S. culture need not entail inculcation of extreme negative views of ones own group. Euro-Americans can generally either melt ino an ethnically neutral mainstream or achieve a biculturalism that is psychologically comfortable because it involves a healthy degree of group self-respect. All this is permitted by the ethnic and caste stratification of U. S. society noted earlier. The same system grants no such comfortable possibilities to Afro-Americans. Thorough social assimilation into the White mainstream is rare at best in the society at large and nonexistant in communities like Blackston. The only acculturation available involves a biculturalism that is deeply ambivalent psychologically. Black people of whatever extraction living in Blackston can achieve no more than assimilation into the local Afro-American society while learning the local bicultural way of life.

This acculturation and assimilation would probably be more rapid and complete than it is were it not for certain other influences from the surrounding society. The system of mainstream invidious comparisons which range different Afro-American groups in higher and lower strata has already been described. Generally speaking, this system confers at least some little advantage to subgroups not from the urban northern U. S., except for Blacks from the rural South. These apparent advantages motivate West Indians and others to maintain and preserve their observable distinctiveness, and some of them no doubt derive considerable psychological satisfaction from the slight social superiority assigned to them by Euro-American evaluations. We cannot doubt that these influences retard the development of cohesiveness and unity among Afro-American subgroups. Presumably comparable factors operate with equal or, more probably, greater force with respect to Hispano-Americans, most of whom can choose to avoid affiliation with Afro-America altogether if they so desire.

On the other hand, we may discern another underlying trend which contributes a further complicating factor to this kaleidoscope of changing patterns. Stated very broadly, demands for progress toward equality, dignity, and self-determination for Black people and other nonwhites are outstripping the ability or willingness of the dominant strata to grant concessions or relative privileges for ethnic subgroups. While this certainly appears to be so in the society as a whole, it is undoubtedly the case in Blackston. The objective basis for this is clear enough. Despite all the gains, real and mythical, of minorities in recent years, it has been thoroughly documented that the gap between Whites and Blacks in all important indices of group welfare has either remained approximately constant or worsened (Fein 1966).

Since inequality is by its very nature a relative phenomenon, not a matter of absolute levels of wealth or status or what-have-you, this gap is of utmost importance. Since the gap is a statistical measure it does not affect all individuals equally. Yet it does indeed apply to the aggregate mass of Afro-Americans, and most of them are well aware of it, even though there is also the individual hope of beating the odds. In these relative terms, most Black people in our community know that today they are certainly no better off than they were ten or even twenty years ago. The affluent White world is too well displayed in the society at large for Blacks to be unaware that their own progress is outstripped by the gains of Whites. Many local citizens have also learned by experience a fact which many middle-class Americans find difficult to credit: the more education a Black person achieves, the more his earnings fall behind those of Whites at the same educational level (cf. Miller 1964, Pettigrew 1966). This knowledge greatly undercuts not only the small privileges offered to sub-minorities but also the integrationist lure of tokenism proffered to Afro-Americans as a group. When this is coupled with the fact that, for most Blackstonians, there is literally no known way out of the ghetto, it becomes clear why people need an alternative (or at the very least a concomitant) to simple allegiance to mainstream cultural values.

At the same time, however, it must also be acknowledged that the absolute changes in comfort and security during recent years, in the society as a whole, are both known to Blackstonians and sometimes mistaken for reductions in inequality. Few are ignorant of the fact that there has been some gradual, partial, and selective softening of ethnic exclusion and racial discrmination. People in Blackston are aware of this from two main sources. Some have direct experience of it, for example through a few more jobs being available through anti-poverty and other governmental programs. Many more have been made aware by the mainstream mass media advertising, celebrating, and exaggerating these changes. All these diverse factors are alluded to in the many spontaneous discussions and debates one hears on the place and fate of the Black man. Staunchly conservative devotees of mainstream values argue that any remaining disabilities suffered by Black people are of their own making. A larger minority seems to feel that today's world offers rewarding opportunities to the ambitious hipster regardless of ethnicity. Yet if there is a single proposition that seems to command most general agreement, it is that any significant gains that may exist for Blacks in general have come about because Afro-Americans have recently been more assertive, demanding, and even threatening toward the general society than ever before.

The latter sentiment may well be the least common denominator of consensus emerging from the whole parallelogram of forces related to change in Blackston. There certainly seems to be no other sense in which the resultant situation can be realistically described as either clear or simple. The attribution of Afro-American advancement to Black self-assertion is probably the major single element which holds together otherwise disparate forces seeking change not only in the local community as such but also in the society as a whole. What makes this consensus meaningful is its consistency with the two deep trends identified above: the growing ubiquitousness of a single Afro-American collective ethnic identity, and the exploding demand for dignity and equality far beyond what is currently granted by the Euro-American establishment. Working from brief experience and incomplete information though we are, we believe these are the prime elements that bring together Black Panthers, New Africans, community council people, a wide spectrum of Afro-American religionists, and a great variety of organizationally uncommitted people -- all in service of advancing community interests through more or less radical demands for change.

Another kind of change is taking place concurrently and closely intertwined with the developments already described. In this as in a good many other respects, Blackston seems to be quite closely attuned to the mood of many Afro-American communities across the country. What we have distinguished as the northern urban variant of Afro-American ethnic culture is being consciously revitalized and developed not only in Blackston and other ghettos but also on college campuses, through the arts and the entertainment world, in portions of the mass media, and elsewhere. It is common knowledge that a new Black Culture is emerging from these efforts. This collective creation is very much in a state of flux and becoming, of ferment which seemingly holds promise of further flowering. Prominent themes include a positively reasserted Black identity, resurrected Black heroes, rewritten Black history, recreated Black mythologies, revitalized Black arts, renovated Black virtues, revealed Black faiths, revolutionary Black power, and a renewed Black life style. Taken together these developments include and transcend both the popular and the obscure forms of cultural Black nationalism, the revolutionary political program of groups like the Panthers, the cultural revolution of the New Africans, and many other specific manifestations. Living in the midst of all this conveys a strong impression of a people in the process of discovering themselves, beginning to assert themselves before the world as never before, preparing to take their place among the other proud peoples of mankind.

Blackston is as much a part of all this as any ordinary ghetto, leaving aside such fountainheads of this renaissance and earlier ones as Harlem. Through many media ranging from mass communications to word of mouth, Blackstonians are informed of the national movement. Indeed many of them participate in it through a variety of means: working in local branches of national organizations: attending local appearances of national leaders (Leroi Jones, John Killens, Herman Ferguson, Betty Shabaz, Mrs. Marcus Garvey, Fanny Lou Hamer, Charles Evers in recent months); adopting and contributing to emerging national standards and styles in fields as diverse as dress and adornment, musical expression, or political rhetoric. We believe this participation stems from much the same basic consensus of beliefs and attitudes described earlier. Accordingly, local involvement in the national movement is subject to similar limitations with respect to the age of most participants, as well as competing motivations and preoccupations, not to mention the inertia of tradition and the forceful opposition of constituted authority. In other words, the contemporary movement for Black advancement has by no means yet won the allegiance of all Blackstonians.

Nevertheless, the larger movement as a whole is so broad and varied that there is probably something in it that commands at least a certain amount of attention and interest from the vast majority of Afro-Americans here. It seems to have an appeal that somehow touches even individuals who remain well outside the consensus required for full commitment or active organizational participation. Natural hair styles and clothing that symbolizes an African heritage are popular with large numbers of people who have no active political affiliation. Nationalistic jazz and rock lyrics are appreciated by many who take part in no organized movement. Black power songs are sung with relish by young children largely or totally ignorant of any revolutionary program. A young man who generally describes himself as "a country boy from the South" is trying to teach his northern wife to say "Black" instead of "Colored." A middle-aged working man whose general attitudes are quite conservative says spontaneously, "I'm black and I'm proud" and then adds with a puzzled look directed at a Negro female who has been opposing "Afro" hair and similar symbols, "But that brightskinned woman ain't black, so what the hell is she?"

This broad appeal presumably means that the themes expressed by the movement somehow speak to the condition of Afro-Americans as they feel it. Our experience persuades us that the movement is generally felt to be a direct assault against the inequality which has been imposed on Blacks for so long. Most obviously, the Afro-American revitalization attacks the external system of social stratification which oppresses and penalizes people for being Black. Probably more fundamental, however, is the attack on the internalized mainstream values which lead Afro-Americans to believe in their own inferiority. No doubt the deepest impact of Black Power, Black Pride, and the rest of the emerging value system comes from its function as an antidote to collective self-doubt and self-hatred. In other words, the Black Movement is discovering or creating a resolution of the stressful ambivalences and ambiguities which are built into people through biculturation. It seems likely that this psychological inner destruction has done even more than outer oppression to cripple and paralyze Afro-Americans in the past. Nor is this by any means only a matter of the past. Every day in Blackston, for example, the schools teach children that they are incapable, destined to fail, and essentially worthless. Since most of the adults have long since absorbed the same mainstream Euro-American lesson, all too often parents collaborate with mainstream institutions to perpetuate self-abnegation and self-destruction in another generation. Every day we are presented with vivid examples of people who deeply believe that they cannot learn, that they are incapable of change, and that they have no ability to succeed in anything of importance or value.

Yet of course these are the same people who recently rose up against a united establishment, captured every public school in their community, and operated these complex institutions for the good of their children. It is doubtful that this would have happened without the psychological strength which people have been gaining, perhaps often unconsciously, from the movement over the past few years. Since two-thirds of their schools were soon recaptured, and the remainder may yet be retaken by outside authorities, it is clear that the community movement is still at an early and indecisive stage. Yet it seems quite possible that the collective internal healing initiated by the national movement may have gained a psychological momentum which could make continued developments along the same lines more or less self-generating. Should this prove to be the case, it seems quite expectable that consistent social strength and cultural creativeness may continue to emerge as events develop and conditions require.

It may be that Blackston presents a particularly significant case history of change in one respect. During the school strike and the powerful attempt to do away with the elected community board of District One, this community felt the wrath of the White backlash more directly and forcefully than perhaps any, except for the ghettos where insurrections have been followed by national guard occupations with indiscriminate shooting into Black homes (e. g. Newark). It may be especially significant that it was under conditions of massive constabulary occupation and joint intimidation by police and teacher-pickets that Blackstonians manifested their most unified determination to reshape their community and its relationship to society. It may be that extreme oppression and provocation -- short of total suppression by force -- may be just the catalysts which, at this stage of development, stimulate the movement to evolve fresh strengths and new depths.

If this is true, its potential importance is possibly very great. The national mood of Euro-Americans at the opening of the 1970's shows every indication of readiness to perpetrate increasing imposition and injuries against Afro-Americans. The national administration in Washington seems determined to cultivate the foremost proponents of the White backlash; both the BPP and RONA have been aggressively attacked by the police around the country; inflation is generally accepted as an excuse for avoiding public expenditures to relieve the plight of Afro-American communities; while rising unemployment which hits Blacks first and hardest has already begun and is expected to continue; organized labor maintains its long-established hard line against nonwhites, and so forth. In short, dominant forces in the nation as a whole seem bent on policies and programs which they know will deepen the crisis conditions already existing in Afro-American communities.

Judging by what we have seen in Blackston, several future developments seem likely if these national trends continue. When the backlash reaches into this community again in whatever form, the probable response will be another resurgence of the Black Movement in some way relevant to the provocation. Longstanding grievances will be rekindled in fields beyond the immediate irritation. Existing motivations to cling to mainstream values, attitudes, and group images will be correspondingly reduced once more. Subgroup differences among Afro-Americans can be expected to decline or be downgraded, and some sharply uncomfortable choices of politico-ethnic allegiance may be posed for Hispano-Americans within the community. In other words, increased ethnic polarization is quite foreseeable under conditions either of Afro-American self-defense against external impositions or of Black activism and militance demanding broad societal changes not yet forthcoming.

Even if there are no dramatic local events along these lines, the general drift of affairs in the environing Euro-American society can be expected to stimulate at least gradual developments consistent with the sequence sketched above. No doubt there will be further growth and spread in the community of the existing conviction among some local people that major institutions as presently structured can never work to the advantage of Afro-Americans. More people can be expected to share the view that no amount of Black dedication to mainstream ideals, and no extreme of assimilationist effort by Negroes, can cause White-dominated institutions to serve Black needs. In short, the hope for rational reform based on humanitarian motives will fade toward oblivion.

Assuming the projections put forward here are correct thus far we can expect that one or the other of two broad alternatives for major societal change will come to be seen by increasing numbers of citizens as the principal choices for a future in which community interests might be served. One alternative is for Afro-Americans to withdraw from mainstream society and build their own parallel institutions for community functions and social services. This is the separatist Black Nationalist orientation which aims to secede from the national social structure of triple inequality and build a better order through ethnic independence. The other alternative is to seek a radical alteration of the existing dominant institutions with respect to the values, attitudes, and interests which they serve. This is a revolutionary orientation which focuses on the multi-racial society as a whole and seeks to overthrow the national system of inequality and replace it with a new order promising justice and dignity for all ethnic and other groups. Both solutions are of course already represented by organizations presently active in Blackston and many other Afro-American communities. All present indications suggest that popular support for both these tendencies will grow in the foreseeable future.

METHODS

8. Participation and Study

Two broad guidelines have influenced our choice and development of research methods. First, we need approaches and techniques that are specifically relevant to the hypotheses being tested and the questions underlying them. Second, we seek to employ methods which have not previously been thoroughly applied to the problems at issue. We feel sure that the failure to resolve these issues is due in part to inadequate and inappropriate methods of investigation. To these ends we have followed, developed, and extended the approaches set forth elsewhere (Valentine 1968a, 1971; Valentine and Valentine 1970). The essential element of our method is continuous, intensive, in-residence, participatory ethnography (cf. Mintz 1969, Conklin 1968, Powdermaker 1968, Wax 1968, Jarvie 1969, Kloos 1969).

An important key to the procedures for obtaining data in this kind of work is that the investigators must reside in the area under study throughout the field research. That is, we live in an apartment in one of the poorest predominantly Afro-American blocks in Blackston. The principal purpose of this arrangement is to immerse ourselves in the life of the people as directly, intensively, and continuously as possible.

From the outset we have presented ourselves straightforwardly as anthropologists who have come to the area to learn as much about its way of life as possible. We explain what this means repeatedly and are asked many questions. Our rule in such presentations and responses is candor with respect to our background, purposes, procedures, sponsorship, and related questions about our work. We have found that our role becomes clear more through experience of us as persons and of our activities as observed behavior, rather than through verbal explanations alone. Thus, we have gradually developed a place for ourselves in the area as acceptable co-residents.

This required an initial period during which direct inquiries were kept to a minimum and directed only to subjects which we had no reason to believe were particularly sensitive. The necessary rapport with people of the area has been achieved through contacts with neighbors, attendance at public events, and seeking out identifiable leaders. Casual contacts have been taken advantage of; informal and formal networks of association and communication have been followed wherever possible. When failures in building or maintaining rapport have led to frustration, the temptation to compensate by renewing ties outside the area has been resisted. Thus we have the needs for human association and companionship to reinforce our other motivations for building the necessary relationships with the community under study.

Our principal techniques of inquiry are a flexible blend of participation, observation, and interviewing. This combination of techniques is continually varied to emphasize one approach or another as developing situations demand. It is a ruling consideration of our field method that, regardless of varying emphasis, all three components of technique are in operation to some degree practically all the time. Thus whenever we are in contact with people we are consciously observing their behavior. Similarly in most situations we expect to engage in at least some minimum of verbal inquiry to help elucidate the immediate social situation, even when observation or participation is the dominant mode. Likewise, we keep ourselves aware that all our activities in the field constitute, to some degree, participation in the life of the area, with effects upon what can be observed and what can be learned by asking questions.

Observation is the dominant mode whenever direct perception and recording of individual or group behavior are practicable. That is, a first principle of the ethnographic approach as applied here is that direct witnessing of ongoing social life is the preferable foundation of research whenever feasible. Interviewing as used here refers predominantly to informal techniques of questioning and discussion. It is expected that little use will be made either of mass survey procedures or of precisely standardized schedules of questions. Most interview situations are flexible and open-ended. Some interview procedures are relatively standardized, such as collection of genealogical information or requests for household economic data. Many more are entirely unstructured, developing as opportunities arise or favorable situations occur.

We have always believed strongly in the basic importance of participant-observation for ethnography. Yet we were not fully prepared for the absolutely central importance which participatory behavior would come to have in the present research. Participation in community life has turned out to be not merely a feasible and effective means for initiating rapport, establishing trust, and gaining access to necessary social contexts. A participant approach is very widely welcomed and even in a good many situations demanded by local people. It has gradually become clear to us that the principal test we have had to pass, in order for our role as anthropologists to be accepted, is the test of reliable performance as functional participants in a great many different settings and contexts.

This approach poses certain problems which the researcher has to live with and cope with as best he can, for they are inherent in the situation and there are no absolute solutions. One condition is the enormous intensity and diversity of interactional demands involved; fortunately we are temperamentally inclined to enjoy a great deal of this. Another problem is the perennial ethnographic one of balancing associations with different factions or other mutually hostile groups or activities. We have found that making sure everyone really understands our purposes as anthropologists helps a great deal with this. Most people can believe and appreciate, in this context, our need to have first hand contact with mutually antagonistic organizations and the like. By far the greatest single problem in this area springs from hostilities and suspicions between the community and the externally controlled institutions within it. Coming to these institutions already known as active community participants makes it far more difficult than it would otherwise be to gain the necessary access to observe institutional operations and processes.

A closely related problem arises from the fact that local people have been engaged in forceful action programs for social change at many different levels in the community. This poses a conflict between the participant approach and requirements or constraints of scientific scholarship, a dilemma which we have resolved in the following way. We accept requests to participate in the rank and file of change movements, but we refuse all invitations to take leadership roles, justifying this in terms of our anthropological mission. We strive to avoid involvement in any activities that may be judged illegal. With respect to political behavior such as lobbying and campaigning, we maintain a strictly observer role. These limitations have extended the time required to establish adequate rapport in a number of important contexts.

The advantages and satisfactions of this approach utterly outweigh its drawbacks. Above all, it affords a very great intimacy and intensity of access to the behavior and experience of community people. Especially as this exposure continues over a period of years, we believe that it will provide a real opportunity to achieve our central methodological goal: to explore the life of the community from within and to approach direct insight into the subjective experience of existence here from community viewpoints. Perhaps it is not an exaggeration to say that the quality of participatory involvement required here is such that ones personal existence becomes co-extensive with the research -- at least to an extent roughly paralleling the involvement of local people in neighborhood and community life. If this seems an extreme formulation, let is not be forgotten that everyone here has both private concerns and wider interests elsewhere in one form or another.

The following presents a sample of selected forms of participation which we have achieved so far on a regular and continuing basis. They are arranged to indicate the various social settings in which they have been applied. The list is representative rather than exhaustive, and it does not include many contexts of activity which will be added as the work continues.

ETHNOGRAPHIC PARTICIPATION

On the block
  - Ritual kinship
  - Preparation and inter-household exchange of food
  - Membership in the block association

On the block and in the neighborhood
  - Neighborhood retailing
  - Membership in the neighborhood parent association
  - Exchanging babysitting and informal child care
  - Informally exchanging goods and credit
  - Celebrating life crises
  - Informal neighborhood entertainment and visiting
  - Following people through relations with the welfare system
  - Following people through other social services

On the block, in the neighborhood and at the community level
  - Following people through hospitalization
  - Following people through arrest, court, jail
  - Attending church services and other religious rituals
  - Sharing celebrations of local and national holidays
  - Initiation into kin and associational networks
  - Attending demonstrations, public political events, etc.
  - Sharing relations with local landlords, merchants, utilities
  - Providing auto transportation for individuals and groups
  - Drinking, gambling, miscellaneous leisure associations
  - Exchanging miscellaneous minor services
  - Explaining our work and making results available

In the neighborhood and at the community level
  - Membership in credit union and consumer corporation
  - Occasional hospitality for temporarily homeless individuals

At the community level
  - Participation in internal operations of the Community Council
  - Participation in internal operations of a local school board
  - Participant observation of communitywide council elections
  - Acting as volunteer consultants to the Community Council
  - Acting as volunteer consultants to other community organizations.

As indicated in earlier sections, we have concluded for theoretical reasons that the minimal social field for our purposes is what local people themselves call their community. In this case, we are dealing with a named urban district. It has generally understood territorial boundaries and a certain historical continuity which is more or less widely known among present inhabitants. This district is poverty-stricken and deteriorated. As a community it is in a state of considerable flux and turmoil, often internally divided and disunited. At the same time, there are operative structures of community-wide organization, principally focused around a community council. The population of roughly 100,000 is approximately two-thirds Afro-American. There are many varieties and levels of exclusively Black associations and organizations within which ethnically distinct culture patterns might be expected to flourish. The community also has a broad array of major mainstream American institutions in the areas of economic life, politics, religion, education, health and social services.

We have not been able to see how a convincing test of prevalent ideas on internal and external sources of Afro-American disadvantage could be made in a community with less than these structural characteristics. In order to approach such a testing ground, however, we have obviously had to tackle a research unit of enormous scale and complexity by traditional ethnographic standards. Our immediate aim has become the rather ambitious one of carrying out a well-rounded ethnography of this community as a whole. Obviously such an undertaking involves a great variety of methodological problems. The principal solution we have developed is participation in diverse roles providing multiple observational perspectives corresponding to major strategic positions in the social field. We have thus found a way to make a simultaneous study-from-within of distinct but interacting organizational and institutional units. The major advantage of this approach is that it transcends the more conventional procedure, in research on complex societies, of examining different institutional constellations separately.

We began our work as participant observers in a residential block and its surrounding neighborhood. We have continued to live in this location, and it remains our base of research operations. Here we have concentrated on domestic life, socialization patterns, sex roles and sex relations, kinship and associational networks, peer groups, streetcorner activities, neighborhood economics, and the smaller localized institutions such as the churches and places of entertainment. It is here we feel that much of the evidence for any ethnically distinct or class-associated culture may be found.

Our participatory approach involves focusing our personal lives within the community. We began simply as newcomers to the block. Initially we sought contacts with neighbors for the simple information and minor aid a family needs in establishing itself in a new neighborhood. We immediately began actively sharing with our new neighbors the varied experiences of tenement life, street activities, neighborhood shopping, and so on. This quickly led into home visits back and forth, cooperative baby sitting, and food exchanges. From an early point onward, we have had people of all ages visiting our apartment every day. We use our car to give many people rides and extend ourselves in this respect somewhat more than other auto owners in the neighborhood. Though we had little money in the early months, being without a grant, we have played what part we could in informal credit networks. While learning by first-hand experience much about the fluctuating local economy, we have found ourselves in the networks by which resources are distributed. Our relatively greater literacy has enabled us to be useful in ways ranging from interpreting legal papers to helping with school homework. People have discovered that we are willing to take part, as ordinary contributing participants, in virtually any neighborhood or community activity, organization, or enterprise -- ranging from block associations to drinking and gambling parties to protest demonstrations.

Most important, we believe, everyone aware of us in the community knows that we actually live under the same conditions as other community members. Like everyone else, we are sometimes without heat, hot water, or functional plumbing. We are as exposed as anyone else to the multiple hazards embodied by the lack of police protection, the frequency of police exploitation, and the common occurrence of police harrassment. We pay the same high prices for the same inferior goods as other community people. Examples could be multiplied indefinitely. The point is that people accept us as genuine participants in community life because that is what we are. From this viewpoint, most of the current anxious debate in anthropological circles about access to Afro-American and other more or less rebellious communities seems to us largely beside the point.

It was not long before we found ourselves drawn beyond our neighborhood base into the wider activities and associations of our block mates and other neighbors. Prominent among the settings to which we were thus introduced were institutions which operate within the community but are controlled from external power centers and are largely staffed by White people who live elsewhere. These include schools, hospitals, the police department, courts, jails, places of employment, major denominational churches, political centers, welfare agencies, and other social service establishments. These institutions channel the most direct influences of the wider society on the ghetto community. It is in these settings that community members daily confront the individual representatives, structural features, customary repertoires and routines of the dominant strata. It is here that we expect to find much direct evidence of interaction between mainstream American culture and whatever class-linked or ethnically determined way of life may exist in our chosen community.

The specific process by which we have expanded our attention beyond the narrower community contexts to the larger institutional settings is important to our method. Our initial approach is to accompany community members through many complete episodes of contact with external institutions. Our role as observers is known to those whom we accompany. Especially in initial contacts, however, we allow institutional personnel to perceive us merely as associates of the community principals in the interaction. Concretely this means such procedures as the following. When people are ill or injured, we go with them to health institutions. Then we rely on our status as healthy associates, temporarily responsible for the patient, to stick stubbornly with the individual through as much of the ensuing process as institutional personnel will possibly allow. We have joined one public school parent association and participated informally in several others. With the help of cooperative community leaders, this has provided many opportunities to observe numberous aspects of the educational process, from classrooms to parent-teacher interactions. We follow individuals as closely as possible through the processes of arrest or complaint to the police, confinement, obtaining counsel, being tried or giving testimony in proceedings against someone else, and the various institutional sequelae of these events. We have visited neighbors or other community people confined in every major penal institution near our area. Accompanying people through interactions with welfare investigators, case workers, surplus food distributors, and various other social service personnel gives us direct access to the impact of agencies in this field. We have taken part in the work day of many employed persons whose work situation either allows temporary volunteer service, such as many anti-poverty jobs, or makes it possible to tag along informally, as in community political field work. In differently structured occupations, where we have so far only visited some places of employment, such as factory and domestic work or truck driving, we are working out plans for a more participatory approach by taking temporary jobs.

What this part of the method does is enable us to experience the externally controlled institutions much as community people experience them. It is of course essential that the individuals who take us with them through these experiences are also well known to us in their own domestic and neighborhood settings. This makes their observed behavior, their volunteered or elicited explanations, and their expressions of feeling in the external settings much more meaningful to us. Thus, in effect, we have the full resources of sample data not only from informant testimony but also from direct observation and considerable participatory experience covering a very large portion of the community's collective life. The varied sources and kinds of data function as mutual checks on one another, giving our findings what we feel is a high level of validity.

It did not take us long to be impressed by the fact that much in the structure and operations of external institutions is hidden from the worm's eye view of the community person -- be he patient, inmate, prisoner, employee, client, or whatnot. So many vital processes go on backstage, that the whole institutional apparatus is hardly intelligible through the community individual's experience alone. Of course, community people do have well developed conceptions of what goes on behind the scenes. However, these conceptions can be neither verified nor disconfirmed by the techniques so far indicated.

This led us directly to the next and by far the most difficult phase of our developing method. As participant observation in the company of friends and neighbors begins to show diminishing returns in any one institution or class of institutions, we attempt to gain institutional access at other levels. This has involved adopting one or both of two additional roles: scientific observer with official permission to carry out research on the institution from within, and consultant to the institution on matters of community relations. The effort to achieve these kinds of access has been enormously difficult, extremely time consuming, often frustrating, and by no means uniformly successful. Bureaucratic obfuscation and diffusion of responsibility, professional suspicion and hostility, endless institutional defensiveness, and many other forms of resistance have been encountered. The early coolness and initial negativism of some community people, including even that of the most militant of Black Nationalists reacting to us as an interracial couple or as social scientists, was never remotely comparable to the problems created by external professionals and bureaucrats.

Nevertheless, we have achieved some successes in this aspect of our approach, with results which we feel amply justify continuing the effort. In two general hospitals and one mental health clinic we have managed to gain considerable freedom of observation, access to medical records, admission to staff meetings, and opportunities to consult with professional and other personnel. In one school district, where the administration happens to be closer to the community than others, we are officially welcome to study all activities from classroom operations to private meetings and negotiations of the district board. Several major branches of the principal community anti-poverty agency have accepted us both as participant observers and as informal consultants at all levels of a variety of activities. The school district and the anti-poverty agency are special cases. This is because indigenous community leadership has enough influence so that external control of their operations is not so complete as in the case of the hospitals. Access to the hospitals has been the most difficult to gain.

The means of gaining such access and opportunities are quite varied. They include making contact through community people who have ties with institutional administrations, demonstrating that we have something uniquely useful to offer as consultants, building personal rapport with selected professionals, invoking our own professional status and affiliations, and a great deal of simply pushing our way into institutional settings where we are not initially welcome. We have hopes and plans for extending similar approaches to a variety of additional institutions. Early targets on our list include a second school district and the welfare administration. Institutional complexes where we expect to have the most trouble and are not sure we will ever succeed include the penal system and the police department.

The focus of our work remains the Afro-American community. Therefore we use our opportunities for data gathering within the larger institutions primarily for elucidating the processes and experiences through which community members go in these settings. We have resisted the temptation to refocus our attention on the institutions as such. We utilize our backstage access to personnel, procedures, and records primarily to throw further light on what happens to individual community clients of the institutions with whom we are acquainted and to categories of clients we know are common or important in the community. Thus we learn much about institutional structure and operations, as well as the beliefs and attitudes of institutional personnel, but the frame of reference is always community relations.

One further feature of this community sometimes makes it necessary to add yet another aspect to our methodology. Many individuals and families have significant current or recent ties and associations entirely outside the community. Prominent among the various reasons for this is the fact that many residents have come here from different areas where they still have kinsmen or other associations. Sometimes crucial aspects of individual or family behavior are not intelligible -- either in terms of community norms or with respect to macro-institutional experiences -- unless one has direct knowledge of these more or less distant associations. In some cases we are able to visit these extra-community settings for brief observations and interviewing. Occasionally community people accompany us on such little field trips and renew the relevant ties in our presence. Thus we can add one more perspective on the behavior and experience of people who belong to the Blackston community.

It is when these various sources of data are integrated in focusing on a case study or other unit of investigation that their combined potential becomes evident. Consider, for example, the case of a household we have followed for nearly a year. Residents of our block for several years, this family includes a foster son who in the past year has been excluded from one elementary school, spent the daytime hours in the streets for three months, been hospitalized as a psychiatric patient for a further three months, and is now attending an elementary school in another school district. We have been able to observe this boy at home, in peer groups, in numerous other neighborhood settings, in two schools, a mental health clinic, and a psychiatric hospital. We have interacted constantly with his foster family, his playmates, and other neighborhood associates. We have been able to see him, not only through the eyes of all these people, but also as he is seen and dealt with by several sets of educational, psychiatric, social work, and other specialists. In turn we know what all these institutional settings and categories of personnel look and feel like to the boy and to his foster parents. Because there was evidence that events in the boy's earlier life in another state might be significant in his case, we spent a week in four different southern communities where he had lived. There we observed every setting in which he had spent much time, interviewed every surviving member of his original family, visited an earlier foster family, consulted with more than a dozen professionals who had had some contact with the case, and inspected all relevant records made by medical, legal, and welfare agencies.

The major point is not that this gives us an unusually detailed individual case history. It is rather that each and every dimension of this case study affords perspectives on behavior patterns and social settings that are relevant to our basic questions about the cultural distinctiveness of the Black community, the impact of outside forces on this community, and the sources of Afro-American inequality. Our method enables us to make an intensive examination, from multiple perspectives, of many kinds of phenomena. We can focus this approach not only on individuals and families but also on numerous other topics. These include local events experienced by ourselves and diverse other observers from both within and outside the community. Also included are local organizations which have variable impacts on different categories of people and institutions and which we ourselves can observe from within.

What we are developing is, in effect, an expanding series of interlocking micro-studies of diverse phenomenal units. All these data-gathering operations are integrated in at least two significant ways. They are unified both by continual reference to our ruling questions and by constant attempts to view each unit of study from multiple participant-observational vantage points. In terms of social structure, we are continually moving out and back again along the varied lines of connection between intimate domestic and neighborhood associations, community organizations, external institutions operating within the community, and ties to other more or less remote communities. In terms of cultural systems, we are continually confronting the contrasting patterns and the shared or common regularities presented by simultaneous exposure to Afro-American behavior in all-Black settings, community people acting in external institutional contexts, and outsiders behaving within the ghetto. The interlocking links among all these diverse scenes and perspectives are so numerous that, after a year and a half of work, there is hardly anything we look at which does not immediately appear to have some probable structural or cultural links with other collective phenomena of which we have knowledge.

This sense of holistic interconnectedness within the accumulating evidence was of course emphatically absent during earlier stages of the work. Indeed there have been periods of discouragement when we really feared we had attacked a social universe too large and complex to be elucidated by ethnographic approaches. Moreover, we remain acutely aware that much time and a great deal more effort will be required before the picture which seems to be emerging will be completed and clear. Nevertheless, by persistently following the approach outlined here we have gained a measure of confidence that holistic ethnographies of communities within a complex society are feasible. The same experience is strengthening our conviction that the instrument of ethnography can produce convincing answers to our basic questions about the position and role of Black people in American society.

9. Comparing Different Methods

In a sense, our entire research program is an experiment in methodology. It is a test of our conviction that ethnography is the preferred method for gathering the necessary evidence to evaluate hypotheses about culture. It is also experimental in the sense that -- as far as we know -- no one has previously attempted a holistic ethnography with quite the scope and complexity of our present work. Beyond this, however, we are anxious to include systematic direct comparisons of contrasting methods in our research design. To this end we have built into our research design several experimental tests to compare the results of non-ethnographic techniques and our own approach in the same community and with the same subjects. The following views of major non-ethnographic approaches are the rationale for this portion of our work.

Survey techniques designed to produce quantitative data for statistical analysis may tell us something about demographic and socioeconomic conditions. Yet these approaches by themselves reveal nothing about culture itself or about social causes (cf. Valentine 1968a). Indeed survey data and statistical formulations necessarily leave open to competing interpretations all questions about causes internal or external to the group under study. For example, recent studies of census data have demonstrated clearly that residential segregation of Whites and nonwhites in American cities has increased over the last few decades (Taeuber and Taeuber 1965). Yet this evidence by itself tells us nothing about the social or cultural causes of the demonstrated change. Hence the inconclusiveness of theoretical and polemical arguments which rely upon such sources to explain phenomena like the disadvantages suffered by the Black poor in the United States. This is why a document like the famous Moynihan Report can be used to support opposing positions and can arouse passionate debate without settling any important issues (Moynihan 1965, Rainwater and Yancey 1967, Valentine 1968a, Valentine et al. 1969).

All studies which rely exclusively or primarily upon interviews as their source of data are equally inadequate for another set of reasons. This applies to the whole range of approaches in which interview data are not systematically checked against independent sources of evidence. We mean to include here not only sociological questionnaires but also genealogical methods sometimes used in isolation by social anthropologists, clinical and other uses of in-depth and open-ended interviewing, collection of autobiographies, and such technical refinements of the interview approach as projective tests. No matter how useful these techniques may be for other purposes, taken alone they cannot produce answers to the questions we are asking.

From our viewpoint, the basic weakness of all interview data is that it consists only of verbal testimony or self-projection by respondents. Without independent evidence it is impossible to know how such data may be related to the actual behavior of respondents or to the social processes and culture patterns which condition group behavior. So for example, Oscar Lewis' biographical studies tell us much about how selected Mexican and Puerto Rican families perceive and describe themselves, but we learn little of their behavior outside the interview situation. This is a major reason why such works are so unsatisfactory as delineations of cultures or subcultures (Lewis 1966, 1968; cf. Valentine 1968a, 1968b). It has recently been shown again by Sidney Mintz (1969) that interviewing alone is inadequate to the task of studying culture, and the indispensible added methodological tool is participant observation.

Many pertinent works of research and analysis bring together combinations of quantitative, statistical evidence with interview materials used for qualitative interpretations. Examples range from the early work of Myrdal and his associates (Myrdal 1944), through Kenneth Clark's Harlem studies (Clark 1965), to Lewis' recent supplementing of biographical family studies with statistical data from San Juan and New York City (Lewis 1968). Recalling today the main conclusions arrived at in the first two of these works illustrates well the failure of such methodological combinations to resolve the problems at hand (see earlier section on theory). Clark exposed some fallacies on which the notion of "cultural deprivation" is based and showed how this concept is used to justify perpetuating the discriminatory neglect of Afro-American interests. Yet the main methods and dominant sources of Clark's work led him no further on the level of theory than the sterile platitude that the Black ghetto is characterized by a so-called "tangle of pathology." Lewis' addition of questionnaire data to the results of his family studies did little or nothing to clarify the relationship between culture and poverty (cf. Valentine 1968b). These combinations of method have failed to produce convincing answers to basic questions because each added approach only contributes its own weaknesses, rather than compensating for the shortcomings of the other techniques applied in the combination.

The design and administration of both sociological and clinical interview instruments appear to be crucial factors in their inadequacy. The schedule of queries is typically drawn up by middle-class persons of Euro-American ethnic status. The questionnaire, interview schedule, or test is then administered by students or professionals who are strangers to the respondents and their community. In a community like Blackston, if not elsewhere, such questioners are generally perceived as representatives of outside groups or authorities. This frequently arouses complex and ambivalent feelings of indifference, suspicion, fear, and hostility. It is almost impossible to imagine how such a human encounter could result in a clear, free transmittal of valid information. There are far too many reasons -- on each side of the encounter -- for errors of misunderstanding, omission, and distortion. Indeed it is extraordinary that so much "scientific" work in fields ranging from demography to psychiatry should be based ultimately on such a deeply faulted form of communication.

To demonstrate concretely the magnitude of error generated by such procedures requires controlled comparison with participant ethnography. Our first effort of this sort involves collaboration with the U. S. Bureau of the Census. Through the Bureau's Center for Research in Measurement Methods, some 27 Blackston households (including our own) have been routinely interviewed according to the standard procedures of three regular census surveys. Meanwhile, we have been studying the same neighborhood as participant observers. In order to make sure that the comparison of methods embodies the controls of a "double blind" experiment, we have given the Bureau no data and have received from them only the location of each household interviewed and the month in which the interview took place. We shall shortly compile a report on the composition, organization, and dynamics of a sample of households including all those visited by census personnel, plus approximately 65 others, for a total of at least 95 contiguous households. Only then will we exchange data with the census bureau.

We predict that this exercise will demonstrate many distortions, inaccuracies, and omissions in the survey data. We further expect that the invalidity of the questionnaire data will be confirmed by our larger sample through statistical extrapolation. Some of the more important expected inaccuracies follow. Adult males, particularly household heads, will be significantly under-reported, giving a spurious finding of female-headed or matrifocal household patterns. Various marital statuses other than "married" will be seriously over-reported for females, producing a misleading impression of marital "instability." Family income will be systematically under-reported. We predict that other important aspects of household composition will be inaccurately reported. In a significant proportion of cases, racial categorization by census enumerators will be different from racial status as understood within the community.

It seems likely that the findings from this comparison will call into question the entire survey interview approach, at least in its many applications to Afro-American communities. It will suggest that a fundamental reevaluation is needed of the many studies built on this kind of data, particularly those attributing matrifocality and marital instability to Afro-Americans as a group. It will sharply raise the issue whether questionnaire surveys in their present conventional form are worth doing in communities like Blackston. It will cast doubts on standard census results far beyond the current concern about estimated underenumeration of young adult male Afro-Americans. We hope to publish results from this experiment jointly with census bureau personnel. We shall also consider expanding this project during the 1970 census.

A second experiment has been proposed and awaits the response of our intended collaborators. At a local hospital a survey will soon be carried out by personnel from the department of sociology at a nearby university, to discover something about health knowledge and health attitudes among community people who come to the hospital for multi-phasic screening. We have proposed to the university personnel that they supply us with the names of a small sample of interviewees from parts of the community where we have been and will be working intensively. As part of our own investigation of health culture we would in any case be covering much the same issues and problems with which the survey is concerned. If we had a named series of subjects, we could make sure that data from these individuals would be included in our observations and inquiries. Later when both the survey and our own study have been completed, we would exchange results for the first time. A detailed and systematic comparison of findings from the two approaches could then be made. We predict an outcome comparable to that expected from our collaboration with the census bureau.

We shall continue to be alert for additional possibilities along similar lines. For example, we understand that a segment of the National Nutrition Survey is scheduled for Blackston, and we are attempting to work out a collaborative methodological comparison with that project.

Meanwhile we are using our various kinds of access to large institutions, described in an earlier section, to make another kind of methodological test. This involves what one may call clinical interviewing in a broad sense of that phrase, including the questioning procedures of psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, social workers, and school guidance counselors. We have many opportunities to test results from these procedures against our participant-observational knowledge of individual behavior, kinship and other network structures, interactional events, and life histories. A major source of such interview data is the individual and family records compiled by educational, social service, and health institutions. It is also most helpful to observe patients during hospitalization or clinic visits, to become directly acquainted with institutional routines, and to discuss both individual cases and community relations with clinicians. Thus far our main success along these lines has been with several hospitals and clinics, including most psychiatric institutions serving Blackston. We are working on achieving similar arrangements with major metropolitan bureaucracies including the public education system and the welfare administration.

While this work is quite difficult and most time consuming, it is also very revealing. The case of the small boy in a foster family alluded to earlier is a good example. This child was repeatedly diagnosed by two different clinical teams as psychotic, uneducable, and a danger to himself and everyone around him. These dire descriptions were made by clinicians who had no direct knowledge of the boy's past or present community life. Through a lengthy process we were able to demonstrate that ethnographic study of the case showed a very different picture, a much more accurate description, and one with much better predictive power than the clinical examinations. The boy was and is adjusted within normal limits to his home and neighborhood environment in terms of local cultural standards. Certain crucial events in his early family history, to which the clinicians attached great diagnostic importance, turned out to be nonexistent. All his more serious adjustment problems developed entirely within large mainstream institutional settings, particularly schools and hospitals. Ultimately we were able to demonstrate that this was not a case of deep pathology. Rather it was a case of incomplete biculturation in which mainstream institutions failed to accomplish their part of the double socialization successfully. At the present time the boy is doing well in a new school and continues to be reasonably well adjusted at home.

We consider this case to be an important piece of methodological comparison with implications of potentially very great significance. Obviously a single case is not sufficient to discredit the entire tradition of clinical interviewing. However, we feel confident that many comparable instances can be found. We believe that given the opportunity to extend this kind of methodological test, it will be possible to show convincingly that conventional institutional techniques for examining and assessing Afro-American individuals are grossly misleading because they ignore crucial social and cultural realities.

A community study by a small research team dealing with a populace of 100,000 obviously requires that the inquiry be highly selective. There is no way in which we can come anywhere near apprehending the total social reality of Blackston directly. It has already been made clear that we have no faith in the validity of questionnaire techniques or similar approaches which attempt to solve the problem by mass sampling and statistical analysis. While we are pleased to employ quantification where possible, the various aspects of our ethnographic approach described earlier generally preclude large-scale samples on the order of those commonly found in sociological studies. For similar reasons we are in no position to apply statistically oriented sampling techniques. In short, we recognize the importance of the sampling problem, but we find no utility in a priori formulas for its solution.

In our view, the central problem of selective observation and inquiry, in the present research, is to insure that the data collected are accurately representative of the community which is our unit of study. In a community as internally diversified as Blackston this means special care must be taken to extend the investigation to all culturally significant divisions or segments within the whole. With this aim and in keeping with the inductive approach of ethnography, we feel that the parameters of the sampling problem can only be discovered as the structure of the community emerges during the course of the work.

While this approach seems to us entirely appropriate, we fully expect that practical reasons, including limits of time and energy, will make it impossible to fulfill its potentialities absolutely or in toto. We have therefore adopted priorities which are consistent with the focus of the work on the basic questions set forth in the opening section above. With respect to ethnic differentiation, for example, our first concern is with the various Afro-American groups as such. Accordingly, we do not expect to attempt fully representative coverage of non-Afro collectivities unless we feel that we have passed the point of diminishing returns in working with the Black peoples of the community. We attach a higher but still relatively low priority to the enclave of middle-class Negroes who live in a middle-income housing unit but who, we have every reason to believe, play little part in Blackston community affairs. We recognize that these decisions will affect the nature of our findings in some respects. If low-income Afro-Americans stand out sharp and clear in the foreground of our final report, with other groups somewhat less clearly delineated in the background or on the periphery, this will only be a natural reflection of our interests and purposes as conditioned by practical circumstances.

Within this framework, some of the more problematical variables in terms of which we seek representative data are as follows. Some of the Afro-Caribbean ethnic subgroups are sufficiently small and scattered so that they do not readily provide substantial samples in immediately available aggregates.

In such cases, we increase the number and range of observations by following kinship and associational networks, gaining access to settings in which the personnel include concentrations of the group in question, such as religious gatherings, social clubs, pool halls, and the like. Another problem grows out of the fact that there are three rather well defined types of residential neighborhoods: the poorest area where privately owned tenements abound, the concentration of public housing projects, and the less deteriorated blocks where two-family, often owner-occupied houses are most common. Thus far our neighborhood associations have tended to be focused in an area of the first type where we have resided since coming to Blackston. We have therefore been careful to take advantage of opportunities to make acquaintances elsewhere both through the networks of our own neighbors and through our multiple associations with various organizations and institutions beyond the neighborhood level. This has given us a fund of connections in other neighborhoods which we shall activate in the future for purposes of micro-comparative study. If it seems necessary and possible we will remove our residence to such different locales in order to achieve the participatory role which we now have in our present neighborhood.

Let us take religious bodies to represent the general class of middle-level institutional organizations which tend to be staffed by community residents and are less often or less completely controlled from outside the community than the large bureaucratic social services agencies and the like. Here a major problem in the sheer multiplicity and variety of congregations. We have tentatively divided these into five categories: mainstream denominations (e. g. Roman Catholic), old-line segregated churches (A. M. E., Southern Baptist), national sects that are not primarily Afro-American in membership (Jehovah's Witnesses, Salvation Army), Afro-American syncretisms (Temple of Islam, Moorish Science Temple), and independent local store-front churches. An immediate goal is to attend several services at two different establishments in each of these categories. Thus far we have had no difficulty in progressing toward this goal by accompanying individuals we know in other contexts to the services of their choice, and we have a further fund of associations which should easily complete this preliminary sample. We expect to find additional contexts of supernaturalistic behavior and are particularly on the alert for certain ones, such as some of the more exotic syncretisms from the Caribbean region.

Perhaps enough has already been said to indicate the nature of our approach to the major externally controlled community institutions. In addition to the principal work in hospitals and schools described earlier, we have gained at least some slight access to various levels of the welfare apparatus, each major correctional institution in the surrounding area, several branches and levels of the court system, both of the two police precincts with jurisdictions extending into Blackston, and the local urban renewal office. Whether we can ever penetrate these bureaucracies thoroughly remains to be seen, though we are not altogether pessimistic. One approach we have so far held in reserve, but may try in the future, is to activate whatever contacts we can to appeal for officially sanctioned access to be granted by authorities at or near the top of each bureaucratic structure.

Brief reference to the problem of validity of data may refocus and emphasize considerations already cited at several points above. Our basic safeguard with respect to validity is that we seek constantly to cross-check our evidence from multiple vantage points in the local social structure, while at the same time constantly posing data from participation against materials from observation against testimony from interviews and discussions. In relation to phenomena which are inherently beyond reach of observational or participatory approaches, such as past events, we make every effort to check the accounts of any one informant against others. With important occurrences in which only a few individuals took part, we attempt to elicit a description from each participant. For major events involving large numbers we try to get at least six independent accounts. With the use of these and consistent methods we feel confident that we can achieve an understanding of this community which is both valid and representative, provided we can spend several years in uninterrupted research within the community.

Our techniques for recording data are generally simple, straightforward, and technologically uninvolved. Two basic forms of record are compiled regularly, generally on a daily basis. The first and simpler of these is a journal which briefly notes personal, neighborhood, and community events of each day judged to be significant to the research. Second is the substantive record of observations, interviews, and participatory experiences. Whenever the flow of obserable behavior or verbal communication will not be inhibited by this procedure, we make written notes as the data come in. After some early errors and miscalculations, it has proved possible to judge well when note taking will have negative effects. As soon as possible after the information is gathered, it is made into a permanent record, either by typing it up or by dictating material on tape for transcription to typescript by our research and administrative assistant. All typed entries are classified, headed, and filed in terms of the categories of the Outline of Cultural Materials (Murdock et al. 1960). These records are prepared in two copies. One copy is filed in our home, the other at the home of our assistant outside Blackston.

We also employ several supplementary recording techniques. Some verbal events such as autobiographical accounts and certain meetings are taped, always with the knowledge and consent of all participants. Thus far all taped material has been transcribed to typescript. In the future we expect to collect considerable taped data which it may be desirable to retain on tape, such as linguistic texts, musical events, and perhaps others. Another important supplementary device is a still camera which takes both black-and-white and color film and is equipped with a flash attachment. We use the camera to document the physical environment and to record all sorts of visually meaningful, more or less public events of social behavior. Thus far we have several hundred photographs which we keep in albums open to inspection by local people (many of whom enjoy them very much). The negatives are stored by our assistant who lives in an area where there is less danger of fire or other threats to valuable materials than in Blackston. A part of this photographic record is expected to be published soon (Valentine 1971).

We are amassing a sizeable collection of documentary materials, mainly relating to the more public aspects of life in the community under study. All pertinent items from two metropolitan dailies and the one major Afro-American weekly newspaper are being systematically collected. As far as possible, all material published by such organizations as the Community Council, the school districts, and the various community action groups is being accumulated. Some moderately rich unpublished manuscript materials of recent historical interest have been discovered in two nearby libraries, and a much larger search for similar data is planned. We are slowly gathering together copies of official city and other governmental documents relating to the area, such as maps of many descriptions, directories of agencies, published plans for various services and developments, handbooks, and so forth. Also relevant here is a small but growing collection of personal documents contributed by neighbors and others, plus a mass of art work by neighborhood children which we hope to supplement with some adult contributions. Our research and administrative assistant has taken major responsibility in this whole documentary area of the work, and her functions of this kind will expand further. She has full responsibility for collecting, arranging, and preserving relevant news media materials. She will soon be doing archival and bibliographical research under our direction.

Particularly as this research project has grown in scope and complexity, all manner of recurrent chores and problems falling under the general rubric of administrative duties have become more and more an impediment to intensive, full-time immersion in the research itself. We are therefore most fortunate to have an assistant who is capable of taking over a great deal of this side of the work independently. The following are additional major areas of responsibility which we have been able to turn over largely to her, thus freeing substantial portions of our time and energy for the work we came here to do. Organizing and implementing administrative relations among granting agencies, the sponsoring agency, and the investigators is no simple matter and requires constant attention. For example, the problem of purchasing even the truly modest quantities of equipment and supplies needed for this kind of work involves careful and firm management of relations with numerous intractable bureaucratic structures. Then we maintain a considerable network of professional communications directly relevant to our work in Blackston. Everything we write for public consumption (see below) is circulated to several dozen selected specialists. All our major manuscripts are therefore mimeographed and sent out to this changing mailing list. We are constantly sending out requests for manuscripts, reprints, and other documents which we have reason to believe may be relevant to our work. We also receive many requests of the same sort for pieces of our work. The task of coordinating all this learned ebb and flow is not an inconsiderable one in itself.

A further aspect of field research in our present situation is one for which we were little prepared before coming here. This is the fact that we have felt multiple pressures to write, including a considerable amount of work for publication. A few of the pieces we have done were manuscripts completed earlier, but our new circumstances and perspective suddenly made them appear in urgent need of revision. Most have been motivated by other considerations. The veritable flood of complicated and diverse data, which almost threatens to overwhelm one participating intensively in a community as complex as this one, excites a strong need to gain intellectual control over the experience by periodic exercises in systematizing the evidence, constructing conceptual frameworks which seem to reflect the natural order of the material, and relating the whole to theoretical ideas.

Equally important, a substantial number of people here are very interested in what we write, not only about them as individuals but about their community and related problems and issues. The most egocentric demands that we make a book out of someone's life we have managed to deflect or rechannel. On the other hand, individuals like the man who asked to read our paper preared for the American Anthropological Association and then commented on it broadly and intelligently, made us begin to recognize, in a way that had not been clear before, that our presentations to the outside world may be a matter of great concern for local people. Then other community members asked us to publish our findings on the local school crisis and related matters. This aroused a slight fear on our part that they might be thinking of grooming us for the role of mouthpiece for particular orientations with the community. When our resulting work was read in the community, however, it turned out that they readdly did want us to "tell it like it is" -- as we saw it. Thus it gradually became clear both to us and to the people around us that an important part of our function as participants in this community is to write about life here. Though it took a while for everyone concerned to arrive at this simple formulation, it makes a good deal of sense because after all, one of the few things (perhaps the only one) that we can do in a way that no one else here is fully equipped to do, is to write about the community in certain ways. We feel most fortunate that we have thus found a way to fulfill a real commitment to this community without compromising our intellectual independence or our professional integrity as we view it.

So we have accepted many opportunities to write, both for scholarly audiences and for others. These have included invitations to give papers at conferences, requests for reviews of books which seemed relevant to our current experience, opportunities to take part in relevant public debates, and other circumstances. The published and to-be-published results are listed below. All this has aroused an acute ambivalence in us. Despite all the strong motives for indulging in the written word, composing work of good quality for publication is extremely time consuming. So of course all the time that goes into writing is lost from participation, observation, interviewing, and all the other data-gathering activities that are basic to research. We have often felt that all the writing is an unwarranted interruption and intrusion upon the research. An unanticipated consequence of all this is that we have been considerably more productive in terms of publication than every before in our professional careers. As may be imagined, this has further sharpened the ambivalence just described. As long as our time here is narrowly limited, this remains an unresolvable dilemma inherent in our situation.

Thus the methodology of our research has developed with the progress of the work, and no doubt further surprises await us. These developments and their results thus far have left us with three strong impressions. First, we feel that the essentials of our methodological approach have proved to be sound. Second, the whole project which seemed so challenging in the beginning now appears enormously more complex, subtle, and demanding than we ever dreamed it would be. Yet, in the third place, our first year-and-a-half here gives us a real conviction that all this diversity and dynanism can be understood and the national order in it can be discovered by proper application of ethnographic method.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Among the funding agencies which declined to support this research are the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Taconic Foundation, Donna Foundation, New World Foundation, McGregor Fund, Phelps-Stokes Fund, Field Foundation, Russell Sage Foundation, Bollingen Foundation, New York Foundation, Metropolitan Applied Research Center, and a major metropolitan Medical Research Council. Accordingly, we decided to do the work without such support. We were therefore grateful to Washington University, St. Louis, for its decision to grant C. A. Valentine one-half salary for one year on leave. B. L. Valentine had recently resigned from a job she held. It seemed appropriate to begin our study of poverty with an approximately 70% cut in income. Nevertheless, we were again most grateful when a few months later we received small grants from the Bureau of the Census and a local hospital. In January, 1969, the Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, a division of the National Institute of Mental Health, generously awarded us a one-year grant to continue our research. The Center declined to extend this support on the grounds that during our first year and a half of work we were "unable to specify with great detail the methods of data gathering," that we were not doing "a systematic ethnography," that "the data already collected reflected a lack of organization," and that "the data presented appeared to be continuations of your previously theoretical views of inner city life with little additional data offered as a result of in-residence ethnography" (Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems 1969). Our work is current supported by a six-month grant from the National Science Foundation.

REFERENCES CITED

Abrahams, Roger D.
1964 Deep down in the jungle. . . Negro narrative folklore from the streets of Philadelphia. Hatboro, Pa., Folklore Associates.
1969 Positively Black. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
1970 Patterns of performance in the British West Indies. In Whitten Szwed 1970a.

Adamson, Florence
1943 ["Blackston"]: a study of recreational facilities. New York School of Social Work.

Arensberg, Conrad M. and Kimball, Solon T.
1965 Culture and community. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World.

Banton, Michael ed.
1966 The social anthropology of complex societies. New York, Praeger.

Baratz, Joan and Shuy, Roger W., eds.
1969 Teaching black children to read. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

B. C. C. ["Blackston" Community Council]
1967 History and description of the community council. Mimeographed.

Berger, Bennett M.
1967 Soul searching: review of Urban Blues by Charles Keil. Trans-action 4:7:54-57.

Bernard, Jessie
1966 Marriage and family among Negroes. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Berndt, Catherine H.
1969 Review. In Valentine et al. 1969.

Bettelheim, Bruno
1963 Class, color, and prejudice. The Nation, 19 October 1963.

Blauner, Robert
1970 Black culture: myth or reality? In Whitten and Szwed 1970a.

Bryce-Laporte, R. S.
1970 Crisis, contraculture, and religion among West Indians in the Panama Canal Zone. In Whitten and Szwed 1970a.

Caplovitz, David
1963 The poor pay more. New York, Free Press.

Carstens, Peter
1969 Review. In Valentine et al. 1969.

Cazden, Courtney et al., eds.
n. d. The functions of language in the classroom. New York, Teachers College Press.

Chevigny, Paul
1969 Police power: police abuses in New York City. New York, Random House.

Clark, Kenneth B.
1965 Dark ghetto: dilemmas of social power. New York, Harper.

Clark, Kenneth B. and Hopkins, Jeannett
1969 A relevant war against poverty: a study of community action programs and observable social change. New York, Harper and Row.

Community Council /of the metropolitan area/
1959 /Description of selected/ Communities. New York.

Conklin, Harold C.
1968 "Ethnography," in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. V, pp. 172-78.

Davis, Allison, et al.
1941 Deep South. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Degler, Carl N.
1969 The Negro in America - where Myrdal went wrong. New York Times Magazine, 7 December 1969: 64-65, 152-160.

Deloria, Vine Jr.
1969 Custer died for your sins: an Indian manifesto. London, Collier-Macmillan Ltd.

Despres, Leo
1967 Cultural pluralism and nationalist politics in British Guiana. Chicago, Rand McNally.
1968 Protest and change in plural societies. Paper presented at American Anthropological Association meeting, Seattle.
1970 Differential adaptations and microcultural evolution in Guyana. In Whitten and Szwed 1970a.

Dillard, J. L.
1964 The writings of Herskovits and the study of the language of the Negro in the New World. Caribbean Studies 4:35-41.
1970 Non-standard Negro dialects: convergence or divergence? In Whitten and Szwed, 1970a.

Dollard, John
1937 Caste and class in a southern town. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Drake, St. Clair
1966 The social and economic status of the Negro in the United States. In Parsons and Clark 1966.

Drake, St. Clair and Cayton, Horace R.
1945 Black metropolis, a study of Negro life in a northern city. New York, Harcourt Brace.

Ellison, Ralph
1964 Shadow and Act. New York, Random House.

Etzkowitz, Henry and Schaflander, Gerald M.
1969 Ghetto crisis: riots or reconciliation? Boston, Little Brown.

Federal Writers Project, W. P. A.
1939 City Guides. New York, Random House.

Fein, Rashi
1966 An economic and social profile of the Negro American. In Parsons and Clark 1966.

Ferman, Louis A.
1964 Sociological perspectives on unemployment research. In Shostak and Gomberg 1964.

Ferman, Louis A. et al., eds.
1965 Poverty in America. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1969 Literacy and the language barrier. Science, Vol. 165:1108-1109.

Frazier, E. Franklin
1932 The Negro family in Chicago. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press.
1957 The Negro in the United States. Revised edition. New York, MacMillan.

Freedomways
1968 Special issue: the crisis in education and the changing Afro-American community. Freedomways 8:4:301-423.

Furnivall, J. S.
1948 Colonial policy and practice. London, Cambridge University Press.

Gans, Herbert J.
1968 People and plans: essays on urban problems and solutions. New York, Basic Books.

Gelman, Anna C.
1966 Hospital core area preliminary survey: selected demographic and epidemiologic characteristics. New York, mimeographed.

Gerlach, Luther P. and Hine, Virginia H.
1968 Five factors crucial to the growth and spread of a modern religious movement. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 7:23-40.
1970 The social organization of a movement of revolutionary change: case study, black power. In Whitten and Szwed 1970a.

Gladwin, Thomas
1967 Poverty U. S. A. Boston, Little Brown.

Glauber, Rae
1963 All neighborhoods change. New York, mimeographed.

Glazer, Nathan and Moynihan, Daniel P.
1963 Beyond the melting pot: the Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City. Cambridge, M. I. T. and Harvard University Presses.

Gluckman, Max and Eggan, Fred
1966 Introduction. In Banton 1966.

Gonzalez, Nancie L.
1970 Toward a definition of matrifocality. In Whitten and Szwed 1970a.

Grier, William H. and Cobbs, Price M.
1968 Black rage. New York, Basic Books.

Hannerz, Ulf
1969a Review. In Valentine et al. 1969
1969b Soulside: inqueries into ghetto culture and community. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell.
1970 What ghetto males are like: another look. In Whitten and Szwed 1970a.

Hansen, Lillian
1966 Demographic data according to health area. The Brookdale Hospital Center. Mimeographed paper.

Harris, Marvin
1969 Personal communication.

Hazelton, Henry I.
1925 The boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens, counties of Nassau and Suffolk, Long Island, New York, 1609-1924. New York, Lewis.

Herskovits, Melville
1950 The hypothetical situation: a technique of field research. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 6:32-40.
1958 The myth of the Negro past. Boston, Beacon Press.
1966 The New World Negro. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Honigmann, John J.
1965a The middle class view of poverty culture, sociocultural disintegration, and mental health. Paper given at University of Kentucky Conference on Cross-cultural Psychiatry and Psycho-ethnology. Lexington.
1965b Psychiatry and the culture of poverty. Kansas Journal of Sociology 1:162-165.

Jaffe, Frederick S., and Polgar, Steven
1968 Family planning and public policy: is the "Culture of Poverty" the new cop-out? Journal of Marriage and the Family 30:228-235.

Jarvie, I. C.
1969 The problem of ethical integrity in participant observation. Current Anthropology 10:5:505-508, 521-522.

Keil, Charles
1966 Urban blues. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Keiser, R. Lincoln
1969 The Vice Lords: warriors of the streets. New York, Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Kloos, Peter
1969 Role conflicts in social fieldwork. Current Anthropology 10:5:509-512, 522-523.

Kochman, Thomas
1969 Black English in the classroom. Chicago, mimeographed. (to appear in Cazden, et al., n.d.)
1970 Toward an ethnography of black American speech behavior. In Whitten and Szwed, 1970a.

Kotler, Milton
1969 Neighborhood government: the local foundations of political life. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill.

Landesman, Alter F.
1964 The early history of ["Blackston"]. Journal of Long Island History 4:1:18-27.
1969 ["Blackston"]: the birth, development and passing of a Jewish community. New York, Bloch.

3

Leacock, Eleanor
1967 Distortions of working class reality in American social science. Science and Society 31:1-21.
1969a Review. In Valentine et al. 1969.
1969b Class and color in urban schools: a comparative study. New York, Basic Books.

Lewis, Hylan
1963 Culture, class, and the behavior of low income families. Paper presented to Conference on Lower Class Culture. New York.
1967 Culture, class, and family life among low income urban Negroes. In Ross and Hill 1967.

Lewis, Oscar
1966 La Vida: a Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty -- San Juan and New York. New York, Random House.
1968 A study of slum culture: backgrounds for La Vida. New York, Random House.

Liebow, Elliot
1967 Tally's corner: a study of Negro streetcorner men. Boston, Little Brown.

Lomax, Alan
1968 Folksong style and culture. Washington, D. C., American Association for the Advancement of Science.
1970 The homogeneity of African-Afro-American musical style. In Whitten and Szwed, 1970a.

Mangin, William
1969 Review. In Valentine et al. 1969.

Mayer, Martin
1969 The teachers strike, New York 1968. New York, Harper and Row.

Mi[illegible] Herman P.
1[illegible] Rich man, poor man. New York, Crowell.

Miller, S. M.
1964 The American lower classes. In Riessman, et al. 1964.
1968 Poverty. Transactions of Sixth World Congress of Sociology:173-185.

Miller, S. M. and Rein, Martin
1965 Poverty and social change. In Ferman et al. 1965.

Miller. S. M. and Roby, Pamela
1969 Poverty: changing social stratification. Ms.

Miller, S. M., et al.
1965 Poverty and self-indulgence: a critique of the non-deferred gratification pattern. In Ferman et al. 1965.
1967 Poverty, inequality, and conflict. The Annals 373:16-52

Mintz, Sidney W.
1969 "Comments: participant-observation and the collection of data," in R. S. Cohen and M. W. Wartofsky, eds., Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science. Dordrecht, Reidel Publishing Co.

Montagu, Ashley, ed.
1966 The concept of race. New York, Free Press.

Moynihan, Daniel P.
1965 The Negro family: the case for national action. Washington: U. S. Department of Labor, Government Printing Office.
1966 Employment, income, and the ordeal of the Negro Family. In Parsons and Clark 1966.
1969 Maximum feasible misunderstanding: community action in the war on poverty. New York, Free Press.

Murdock, George P., et al.
1960 Outline of cultural materials. Fourth edition. New Haven, Human Relations Area Files.

Myrdal, Gunnar
1944 An American dilemma: the Negro problem and modern democracy. New York, Harper and Row.
1962 An American dilemma: twentieth anniversary edition. New York, Harper and Row.

National Commission on Civil Disorders
1968 Report of the national advisory commission on civil disorders. New York, Bantam Books.

National Science Foundation
1969 Grants for scientific research. Washington, National Science Foundation.

Parsons, Talcott
1966 Full citizenship for the Negro American? A sociological problem. In Parsons and Clark 1966.

Parsons, Talcott and Clark, Kenneth B., eds.
1966 The Negro American. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1966 A profile of the Negro American. Princeton, Van Nostrand.

Polgar, Steven
1960 Biculturation of Mesquakie teenage boys. American Anthropologist 62:217-235.

Powdermaker, Hortense
1968 "Field work," in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Vol. V, pp. 418-24.

Rainwater, Lee, and Yancey, William L.
1967 The Moynihan Report and the politics of controversy. Cambridge, M. I. T. Press.

Reisman, Karl
1970 Cultural and linguistic ambiguity in a West Indian village. In Whitten and Szwed 1970a.

Riessman, Frank et al., eds.
1964 Mental health of the poor. New York, Free Press.

Rodman, Hyman
1965 The lower class value stretch. In Ferman et al. 1965
1968a Family and social pathology in the ghetto. Science 161:3843:756-762.
1968b Why the poor are poor: review of Culture and Poverty. Science 161:3842:675-676.

Rose, Arnold
1962 Postscript twenty years later. In Myrdal 1962.

Ross, Arthur M. and Hill, Herbert eds.
1967 Employment, race, and poverty. New York, Harcourt Brace.

Rubin, Vera, ed.
1960 Social and cultural pluralism in the Caribbean. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 83.

Seligman, Ben B.
1968 Permanent poverty: an American syndrome. Chicago, Quadrangle Press.

Shostak, Arthur B. and Gomberg, William, eds.
1964 Blue collar world: studies of the American worker. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Smith, M. G.
1960 Social and cultural pluralism. In Rubin 1960.
1965 The plural society in the British West Indies. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Spiegel, Hans B. C.,ed.
1968 Citizen participation in urban development. Vol. I - Concepts and issues. Washington, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

1969 Citizen participation in urban development. Vol. II - Cases and programs. Washington, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

Stewart, William A.
1962 Creole languages in the Caribbean. In Study of the role of second languages in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Frank A. Rice, ed. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.
1964 ed. Non-standard speech and the teaching of English. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.
1965 Urban Negro speech: sociolinguistic factors affecting English teaching. In Social dialects and language learning, Roger W. Shuy, ed. Champaign, Ill., National Council of Teachers of English.
1966 Observations on the problems of defining Negro dialect. In Conference on the language component in the training of teachers of English and reading: views and problems. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Council of Teachers of English.
1967a Nonstandard Speech patterns. In Baltimore Bulletin of Education, 43:52-65.
1967b Sociolinguistic factors in the history of American Negro dialects. The Florida FL Reporter 5:no. 2.
1968 Continuity and change in American Negro dialects. Reprinted in Readings in American dialectology, Harold B. Allen and Gary N. Underwood, eds. (In press).
1969a On the use of Negro dialect in the teaching of reading. In Baratz and Shuy, 1969.
1969b Comments on Valentine's "Its either brain damage or no father." Ms.

Taeuber, Karl. and Taeuber, Alma
1965 Negroes in cities -- residential segregation and neighborhood change. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, Edgar ed.
1939 Race relations and the race problem. Raleigh, N. C.

U. S. Bureau of the Census
1952 U. S. census of population: 1950. Vol. III. Census tract statistics, chapter 37. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office.
1962 U. S. census of population and housing: 1960. Census tracts. Final report PHC(1) - 104, Part I. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office.

Valentine, Charles A.
1967 Alternative models in contemporary New World Negro studies. Paper presented at American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting. Washington.

1968a Culture and poverty: critique and counterproposals. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
1968b Review of Slum culture by O. Lewis. In American Sociological Review.
1969a Incomplete diagnosis: review of Black Rage by Grier and Cobbs. The Nation 208:1:24-26.
1969b It's either brain damage or no father: The false issue of deficit vs. difference models of Afro-American behavior. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meeting, Washington, D. C.
1971 What the anthropologist does: Research in a complex society. In Anthropology Today: an Introduction. Del Mar, CRM Books. In Press.

Valentine, Charles A. and Valentine, Betty Lou
1969 Ethnography and large-scale complex sociocultural fields. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association meetings, New Orleans.
1970 "Making the scene, digging the action, and telling it like it is." In Whitten and Szwed, 1970a.

Valentine, Charles A., et al.
1969 C. A. book review of Culture and Poverty. Current Anthropology 10:2-3:181-201.

Van den Berghe, Pierre L.
1967 Race and racism: a comparative perspective. New York, Wiley.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Davis, Allison
1939 A comparative study of American caste. In Thompson 1939.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Srole, Leo
1946 The social systems of American ethnic groups. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Wax, Rosalie Hankey
1968 "Observation, participant," in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. II, pp. 238-41.

Whitten, Norman E. and Szwed, John F., eds.
1970a Afro-American anthropology: contemporary perspectives. New York, Free Press.
1970b Introduction. In Whitten and Szwed, 1970a.

Willhelm, Sidney M.
1969 Black man, red man and white America: the constitutional approach to genocide. Catalyst, Spring:1-62.

Yinger, J. Milton
1960 Contraculture and subculture. American Sociological Review 25:625-635.

APR 16 1970